1-1-1981

A historical study of the relationship between the philosophy of John Dewey and the early progressive colleges : an investigation of the role of science.

Janice Crafts Eldridge
University of Massachusetts Amherst

A HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JOHN DEWEY AND THE EARLY PROGRESSIVE COLLEGES: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF SCIENCE

A Dissertation Presented

By

JANICE CRAFTS ELDRIDGE

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1981

School of Education

A HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JOHN DEWEY AND THE EARLY PROGRESSIVE COLLEGES: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF SCIENCE

A Dissertation Presented

By

JANICE CRAFTS ELDRIDGE

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. Leverne Thelen, Chairperson

Dr. William Kornegay, Member

Dr. Marion Rhodes, Member

Professor Philip Eddy, Consultant

Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to:

. . . my children who bore patiently and with humor the long years of study and writing which this dissertation exacted, who seemed to enjoy having "Mother" share their college years

. . . to my mother whose support and ready ear were lovingly given and most gratefully received

and

. . . to my friends who ever urged me on and tolerated my long obsession.

PREFACE

A Dissertation in the Making

> Has mankind rewarded its scholars? Then consider the torture they inflict upon themselves: they add, they alter, they blot something out, they put it back in, they do their work over, they recast it, they show it to their friends, they keep it for nine years; yet they never satisfy themselves. At such a price they buy an empty reward, namely, praise--and that the praise of a handful. (Erasmus Desiderius in Praise of Folly, 1509)

Had I read Erasmus before embarking upon this "folly," I might never have proceeded. But I did and now it is done. And in the process there actually did transpire something worth noting.

Coming as I do from the sciences, having been a working chemist, a professor of Chemistry, and an ABD in Chemistry for several years, I was not at all sure as I started this endeavor that science education was a field to which I was well suited. My prior education had been long on equations and short on words. Nor had my undergraduate experience with education courses been highly esteemed. But due to the excellent recommendations of my advisor, Dr. Thelen, my graduate work in education has been in my view outstanding. It was he who recommended Professor Eddy's courses in philosophy and Dr. Kornegay's seminar in The Progressive Era in Education. In these areas I found to my great astonishment the intimate role which science played in Deweyan philosophy and the existence of a whole movement in education build, the common wisdom said, upon Dewey's philosophy. Out

of these findings grew this study, combining John Dewey's thought, progressivism and science in the realm of higher education.

In effect, however, the most striking feature of these years of study has been the re-education of a chemist. Denied in earlier educational endeavors any exposure to philosophy or to history, I have found my brief excursions into each as rewarding as past delving into scientific intricacies. The discovery has been made that good writing is as demanding a task as careful laboratory work. The educational role of science suddenly looms larger as the point of view shifts from behind the desk to a broader reference illuminated by Dewey's concerns. It is clear that the whole course of my graduate studies in education and the writing of the dissertation have influenced my perspective on education in the sciences.

For this, I wish to thank my committee members--Dr. Thelen for his expert guidance; Dr. Kornegay as the good-humored source of all that related to historical research and progressivism; and Dr. Rhodes (herself a chemist and professor) for her unflagging enthusiasm and probing questions. Unfortunately my insistence that I also needed Professor Eddy on my committee was not convincing to the Graduate School, as he was technically labeled a consultant. In actuality he was a full and active member of the committee and gave large amounts of time to reading and writing critiques of the text. Without his contribution, without the comforting knowledge that he would immediately detect any distortions of Dewey's thought that emanated from my pen, the quality of this study would have been impaired.

To all my committee, I give my enthusaistic and genuine gratitude.

I also extend my appreciation to the Center for Dewey Studies who provided partial support for this research. Their support was more than merely financial; it helped (by its tacit approval) to alleviate some of the inevitable uncertainty one feels in writing.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge the assistance of all those at the four colleges of the sample who contributed in many ways--those faculty and staff members who granted interviews, and those of the library staffs who extended their professional services. The wealth of material used in this study directly reflects the extent of their cooperation.

To the colleges of the sample, I wish to add one more note. On your campuses I saw a richness in those facets of education that were most neglected in my own scientific education. My strongest criticism of your style of education is that it has in turn neglected much of what I feel is beneficial from my field. My concept of an ideal education might well be a successful blend of yours and mine--perhaps a real Deweyan education.

ABSTRACT

A Historical Study of the Relationship Between the Philosophy of John Dewey and the Early Progressive Colleges: An Investigation of the Role of Science

May, 1981

Janice Crafts Eldridge, B.A., Jackson,
M.S., Tufts College, Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Dr. LeVerne Thelen

This study is specifically designed to investigate the relationship between Deweyan thought and the progressive education movement as it materialized in higher education. The focus is upon the original design and function of a sample of early progressive colleges during their years of planning and their first decade of operation.

The instrument for the evaluation was a Model for education at the college level based upon Deweyan philosophy and an extrapolation of his thought. The Model specified two aims: (1) the development of the power to think reflectively, using the methods of science; (2) education dedicated to the growth of the individual directed towards social goals. Four characteristics of a Deweyan College were identified: (1) the use of scientific teaching methods; (2) a structured curriculum; (3) a requirement for specialization; (4) organization as an experimental college. The colleges selected for the sample were Bennington, Sarah Lawrence, Bard, and Goddard. These colleges were evaluated

from data collected from interviews, archival material and the general literature.

Three conclusions were drawn. First, there was a wide chasm between the Deweyan College of the Model and the colleges of the sample. Progressive thought as exemplified in these colleges was shown to be little related to Deweyan thought. Second, the colleges of the sample gave to the individual am emphasis inconsistent with Deweyan philosophy. The roots of this emphasis were examined and found to be based upon a romantic progressivism overlaid with psychological theory. Third, science at these institution was largely neglected, whereas the Model specified the study of science as consistent with Deweyan thought. The anti-intellectual effects of this treatment of science were noted.

This study concluded with speculations on the impact of these early colleges on the educational world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The year 1979 was designated by the United Nations as the Year of the Child, a move planned to enhance the quality of life for the world's children by focusing attention upon them. This action was foreshadowed in 1902 when Ellen Key published The Century of the Child. Hofstadter (1962, pp. 363-364) pointed out that this book "epitomized the expectations of those who felt that the child had been newly rediscovered." Educators began to place the child in a central place in the world, freed from the "old" system of education. One might then conclude that this Year of the Child marked nearly a century of achievement in improved education for the youth of the country, liberated from the shackles of authoritarian instruction. Yet in this year 1979 there was evidence of a definite movement in an opposing direction suggesting a measure of dissatisfaction with the new outlook.

It is clear that perhaps the most crucial issue in education today in the public mind is that of the quality of education. A growing suspicion that many high school graduates or even college degree holders are not functionally literate has produced such actions as the establishment of minimum proficiency examinations for students at various levels and suggestions that prospective teachers be required to pass competency examinations in English. The "Back to Basics"

movement has flourished and has reached into higher education. According to a recent report on changes in Harvard's policies: "It's Back to Basics in Many American Colleges" (Haney, 1978).[1]

Schiefelbein dramatically described the situation providing impetus for the changes at Harvard.

> John [Doe, graduating Senior] has never read any of Shakespeare's plays. He is wholly unfamiliar with the works of Plato and Aristotle. Some of his classmates have taken no mathematics courses at Harvard, nor have they passed any exam to show proficiency therein. Others have not studied biology or chemistry or physics or astronomy. They know virtually nothing about religion. Among their friends are students who have yet to crack a textbook on philosophy, economics, art, or music.
>
> The commencement exercises have begun, and the president of Harvard intones the traditional proclamation: "Welcome to the company of educated men and women." (Schiefelbein, 1978, p. 12)

In 1902 John Dewey described a similar "confusion in the school room." Unless, he said, we gain a philosophy of organization, a sense of the unity of the educative process and educative material,

> We shall be forever oscillating between extremes, now lending ourselves with enthusiasm to the introduction of art and music and manual training, because they give vitality to the schoolwork and relief to the child; now querulously complaining of the evil results reached, and insisting with all positiveness upon the return of the good old days when writing, spelling, and arithmetic were adequately taught. (1902, p. 44)

---

[1] It was at Harvard that the Dean, Henry Rosovsky, undertook the redefining of undergraduate education and convinced the Harvard faculty to accept a more structured curriculum with firm core requirements, effective in the fall of 1979. Underlying this extensive curricular reform was concern about the widespread failures of their General Education program. Although this program specified a balanced distribution of courses for the individual, lack of adequate controls allowed evasions of the intent of the General Education program, and there was no guarantee of a minimum standard for graduation. This was perceived, perhaps quite rightly, as an unfavorable reflection upon the prestigious Harvard education.

Thus it can be seen that fashions in education change,[2] and Grant and Riesman (1978) have aptly entitled their record of its struggles The Perpetual Dream. Definitions of education mutate as the political, social, and economic environment of the times evolves. Educational theories develop, some disappear with little effect, some influence whole future generations of educators.

This study will be concerned with two historically significant facets of educational thought and practice--Deweyan philosophy and progressive education as it crystallized in the area of higher education. The general impact of John Dewey on education was profound. He has been popularly considered to be a major source of what is called progressive education and in consequence has borne the brunt of much of the criticism aroused by the "new" education.

These complaints have varied in severity and in particularity over the years. Meriam (1959, p. 22) remarked that "the general public assigns to [Dewey] large responsibility for much of the adversely credited progressive education in our modern schools." Senator Hayakawa, who engaged to support the Hatch amendment limiting the use of psychological testing or treatment in public schools, "inquired rhetorically how such tests ever got to be a part of public education. It is the result of a flourishing heresy, he said, a heresy that rejects the idea of education as the acquisition of knowledge and

---

[2]Dewey wrote: "It sometimes seems as if educational tendencies might be compared to those of the changes in clothes. Styles and patterns alter; the essential garments remain the same; and even these superficial alterations appear after all to work around in cycles. The more they change, the more they are the same." (Dewey, 1917, p. 287)

skills. Instead, the heresy regards the fundamental task of education as therapy" (Kilpatrick, 1978, p. 12). Others, such as Admiral Rickover and President Eisenhower, chided Dewey for his "life-adjustment" program and his "country-club existensionalism" (Archambault, 1959, Foreword).[3]

The persistence and vagueness of the myth of Dewey's corruption of education can further be illustrated with two current examples.

A young anthropologist recently informed a faculty group that research done by Margaret Mead (1931) on some obscure tribe indicated that complete freedom for the child, characteristic of that particular culture, resulted in less creativity rather than more, the reverse of what one might expect. The children, left almost exclusively to their own devices, became, in his words, "mushrooms." These data he promptly extrapolated, with decidedly negative intonations, to the "Deweyan" idea of open classrooms with no structure.

From North Edgecomb, Maine came this letter to the Editor of Maine Life.

> The citizens of Maine should take a long hard look at any attempt . . . to teach courses in wisdom. We have had too much of this John Dewey, Warren court school of thought. . . . Our nation is being menanced by these namby-pamby schools, judges, and John Dewey-conditioned administrators. It has been this writer's observation that wisdom is more likely to come from an old ship's captain (ah, but these iron men have fallen with the leaves of time), from a tiller of the soil, or from a loving parent than it is from a learned academician. (Merry, 1979, p. 5)

---

[3]Sister Mary Ruth Sandifer reported in American Lay Opinion of the Progressive School on her review of two hundred magazine articles, and concluded that they reflected essentially negative attitudes towards progressive education (1943, p. 198).

Statement of the Problem

It is specifically proposed to investigate Deweyan thought in its relationship to selected progressive colleges. There does exist an area of education which represents the expression of the progressive education movement in higher education. After some years of experimentation in the primary and secondary schools, there was a surge of interest in extending the "new" education beyond the high school. There then appeared in the 1920's and 1930's a number of freshly created or philosophically renovated colleges, which have been generally accepted as examples of progressive education in action in higher education. These are also commonly related in the public eye to John Dewey.

This study will examine the philosophies which guided the development of these institutions. It will seek to determine to what extent these colleges succeeded in providing a Deweyan education for its students. Suitable data on the aims and practices of each college will be obtained for the investigation of this issue.

To assist in such an examination, a theoretical model for education at the college level will be constructed upon Deweyan philosophy, designed to establish the essential criteria that an adherence to Dewey's thoughts on education would dictate. The use of this model as an evaluating instrument will allow a comparison of progressive education (exemplified in the chosen instititutions) with an education based on Dewey's philosophy.

It is quite evident that the proposed model can not be

extracted whole from Dewey's works, extensive as they are. Since he actually wrote little on higher education, it will be necessary to extrapolate his basic principles to the college level, and careful scrutiny of pertinent publications melded with a cautious synthesis of related ideas will be required.

One of the principal issues to be pursued in the process of model-making is the question of the proper role of science and scientific inquiry in Dewey's philosophy. It is one contention of this study that Dewey saw science as a powerful tool for good and evil in our society, that he felt that education must teach its methods of thinking to all students so that they might make reasonable judgments upon the proper uses of science. Dewey insisted that reason in a student is developed by the continuous process of inquiry, and that knowledge is an end of inquiry (1938/1960, p. 8). Inquiry, he said in Democracy and Education, involved doubt utilized "for purposes of inquiry by forming conjectures to guide action in tentative explorattions, whose development would confirm, refute, or modify the guiding conjecture" (1916/1966, p. 149). In describing his own Chicago School, he wrote of developing teaching methods for securing "the transformation of crude and sporadic impulses into activities having a sufficiently long time-span as to demand foresight, planning, retrospective review, the need for further information, and insight into principles of connection" (1936, p. 474). [Underlining added.] Clearly, the above properly defines scientific method.

It is proposed that the failure to incorporate this fundamental aspect of Deweyan thought into the new education may have been a

factor in the public disenchantment described earlier. Therefore, a crucial element in the model is an emphasis upon science and scientific method. In Logic--The Theory of Inquiry this concept was considered in detail (1938).

Statement of the Hypothesis

This hypothesis will be tested:

A neglected factor in the development of the selected colleges, dedicated to the goals of progressive education and to Deweyan philosophy, has been the primacy of science and scientific method as fundamental to educational practice, a primacy Dewey consistently advocated.

Significance of the Study

By clarifying, within the framework of the early progressive colleges, the relationship of Dewey to progressive education, it might be possible to counter the antagonisms to his theories, examples of which have been given above. Perhaps the source of some of the current dissatisfaction with our educational system that are surfacing in the call for a more "Basic" curriculum can be identified. It seems possible that vulgarizations of Dewey's thought might be offered as areas in need of change in Higher Education, leaving intact the advances that education has made from thoughtful applications of Deweyan philosophy. Another strong point to be made, in case of an affirmation of the hypothesis, is that of the importance of inquiry utilizing scientific method in the college education of our youth. The

evaluation of the study of science itself as subject matter might also be facilitated. Fruitful suggestions therefore may be generated in the area of curriculum at the college level, combining elements of the progressive and the traditional.

Reference List

Archambault, R. Foreword. In W. Brickman & S. Lehrer (Eds.), John Dewey: Master educator. New York: Random House, 1966.

Dewey, J. The educational situation. New York: Arno Press, 1969. (Originally published, 1902).

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Free Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1916).

Dewey, J. Current tendencies in education. The Dial, April 5, 1917, pp. 287-298.

Dewey, J. The theory of the Chicago experiment. In Mayhew, K. & Edwards A. The Dewey school. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936.

Dewey, J. Logic--The theory of inquiry. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1960. (Originally published, 1938.)

Grant, G., & Riesman, D. The perpetual dream: Reform and experiment in the American college. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Haney, D. Back to college. Harvard takes the lead. It's back to basics at many American colleges. Sunday Republican, Springfield, Massachusetts, September 10, 1978, pp. E-1; E-4.

Hofstadter, R. Anti-intellectualism in American life. New York: Random House, 1962.

Key, E. The century of the child. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1909. (Originally published, 1902.)

Kilpatrick, J. The behavior boys get their come-uppance. Springfield Union, September 6, 1978, p. 12.

Mead, M. The meaning of freedom in education. Progressive Education, 1931, 8, 107-109.

Meriam, J. John Dewey in history. In W. Brickman & S. Lehrer (Eds.). John Dewey: Master educator. New York: Random House, 1969. (Originally published, 1966.)

Merry, E. Letters to Maine life. Maine Life, January, 1978, pp. 5-6.

Sandifer, M. American lay opinion of the progressive school. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1943.)

Schiefelman, S. Confusion at Harvard: What makes an educated man? Saturday Review, April 1, 1978, pp. 12-17.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

In planning the approach to the testing of the proposed hypothesis, it proved useful to identify the specific questions whose answers would provide relevant data. The preliminary reading (reviewed in Appendix E) served as a guide in the elaboration of pertinent questions which are presented below.

Implementing Questions to be Investigated

A. What would be a suitable model for education at the college level, one based on Deweyan philosophy?

In order to construct a model that would accurately reflect Dewey's thoughts on education, it is necessary to pose several additional discriminating questions. A working definition of progressive education must be developed. One must ask how Dewey perceived progressive education and how he evaluated it in light of his own philosophy. Although he published little in this area, one must theorize as to how he would have designed a college if given the opportunity to do so. Then it will be possible to suggest criteria for the identification of an institution as one offering a "Deweyan" progressive education.

B. To what extent does the individual college in the sample conform to each of the criteria established as essential

in defining the theoretical model?

Here again a minimum subset of questions is valuable.

1. What were the founders' aims and goals?
2. Did they build in means for evaluating the extent of goal achievement?

   This is related to Dewey's concern that education should be scientifically designed and evaluated (Dewey, 1929).

3. What importance was given to science per se in the early planning and functioning of these colleges?

   As described in the introduction, science and scientific inquiry will play an important role in the model. In consequence, the place of science in the sample institutions must be ascertained. Various aspects relating to science that would be useful are:

   a. philosophic concern
   b. budgetary support
   c. laboratory facilities
   d. library resources
   e. faculty
   f. curriculum design, especially the availability of science courses and requirements in regard to science
   g. requirements for and availability of specialization

      This aspect will be discussed later, when it is presented as a logical inference of Deweyan educational thought.

4. What were the statistics on student utilization of science resources?

The best laid plans of men do go astray, and students do subvert the most carefully designed curriculum. Thus hard data can assist in the delineation of the true impact of a science curriculum upon the student population.

5. Was there an emphasis on scientific method in the general teaching philosophy, in and out of science areas?

This question may well prove to be the most fundamental of all.

C. What colleges would serve as illuminating examples of pioneering progressive colleges?

Again, additional questions clarify the situation.

1. Was the college founded or restructured as a self-styled "progressive college?"
2. Was Dewey's educational philosophy acknowledged (or can it be inferred) as a critical influence?
3. Was the institution generally accepted in educational circles as a pioneer in progressive education?
4. Did the college acquire enough public support and acceptance to remain operative to the present time?
5. Was the college presented as an experiment in education?

Design of the Study

There are two logical divisions to this research, a theoretical investigation and an empirical study of a sample of progressive

colleges. The combination of the two is designed to pursue the questions listed above and thereby facilitate the collection of sufficient data for a searching evaluation of the questions advanced earlier.

The theoretical investigation. The first section will deal with the philosophy of John Dewey in its relationship to the progressive education movement. It will present a careful exposition of his thinking about education and will attempt a clarification of the importance to him of science and scientific method, not only as applied in the practice of education, but also as to its influence upon his basic philosophy. The focus will be upon the creation of the model for the evaluation of the sample colleges. This will comprise the content of Chapter III.

The empirical study. This section will have two major objectives. The first will be the establishment of a suitable sample of progressive colleges; the second, the collection of specific data from each.

The selection of the sample colleges. It was decided that the questions posed on page 13 were adequate criteria for selecting the experimental sample. Added constraints of time, geography, and cost were also considered. The final choices were Bennington, Bard, Sarah Lawrence, and Goddard to be the subjects of this investigation. Justification of the choice of each is contained in the appropriate chapters below.

The collection of data. The particular means of data collection are varied. They may be summarized as below:

A. A search of Dissertation Abstracts to identify related research.

B. A computer search of Eric, also to locate relevant studies.

C. A review of professional and popular literature on early experimental colleges, in particular the colleges in the sample.

D. Interviews with available faculty, such as those on campus during the first decade, or those conversant with the historical background.

E. Visits to each college in the sample to conduct a library and archival search for:

1. Early documents relating to the founding philosophy. Data relevant to the founders' aims and goals and philosophical concerns should be obtained.
2. Lists of founders and supporters. Obvious connections may be made, such as the prominence of Kilpatrick, an ardent Dewey disciple, in the founding of Bennington, lending credence to the assumption of a strong Deweyan influence. More subtle relationships may arise from a careful scrutiny of such lists.
3. Early financial reports and budgets. These should clarify the position accorded to science itself in the early planning and functioning in terms of budgetary support for science faculty and for laboratories.
4. Lists of faculty and faculty assignments. The ratio of science to non-science faculty might provide

additional data on the role of science in the early years.

5. Early catalogues. These may be considered to be less than hard data, but at least they should indicate the public image which the colleges wished to portray. Often goals and philosophy are printed. The actual lists of courses offered will supply some rough idea of the emphasis upon science itself and the course descriptions probably reflect the current fashion in educational methods on campus at the time of publication.
6. Transcripts and/or summaries of students' participation in science courses.
7. Student publications. These should be examined for reflections on teaching methods, especially the presence or absence of an emphasis upon scientific method in the general teaching philosophy.
8. Formal self-evaluations. These should be valuable sources of data on many areas pertinent to Question B. Of particular interest will be the extent to which scientific method was practiced by the college which sees itself as "experimental."
9. Informal external evaluations in periodicals and magazines. These data may well be available outside of the college library. However, sometimes collections of publicity on the early years are filed in the college archives. Bennington, for example, has a scrapbook of

the early popular literature, assembled by one of the founders of the college.

10. Formal external evaluations by outside agencies.

11. Records of project work done by the students. Bennington College requires a Senior Project for graduation, and all written projects accepted by the faculty are on file. Examination of the quality and the content of these papers might be an interesting primary source.

The results of this portion of the research will be collected in a series of chapters (IV through VII), one for each of the sample colleges.

The final chapter will be reserved for summation and conclusions.

Clarification and Delimitation

Assumptions. A basic unexamined assumption is that there is indeed a connection between John Dewey and the progressive education movement. A second assumption is that both were important in the history of the theory and practice of American education.

Definitions. The definition of terms becomes one of the difficult problems.

Progressive education. This has been variously defined. For the time being, it will suffice to note a sampling of these attempts. Several authors have pointed to its diversity and identified prominent

strands, with an emphasis upon particular elements.

Graham (1971):
1. The importance of the needs and interests of the child must be recognized.
2. The school has a responsibility for the restructuring of society.
3. The need for scientific research on curriculum is a primary concern.

Smith (1961):
1. Education should include vocational training or "education for life."
2. Child-centered education should be the focus of the "new" education.
3. The schools should accept a creative social role. (pp. 171-172)

Cremin (1973):
1. One element was focused on child-centered education (which peaked in the 1920's).
2. Another emphasis was social reform (which peaked in the 1930's).
3. A third strand was the introduction of scientific management (which was at its height in the 1940's). (p. 1)

Benezet (1943/1971):
1. "The chief criterion for a . . . college's being called 'progressive' is <u>the school's or college's own willingness to be known as such</u>." (p. 14)

> Dewey (1952): "I shall use the designations 'progressive education' and 'the progressive education movement' as common names, that is, as convenient linguistic means of referring to the whole complex of diversified movements and efforts to improve the practice and theory of education." (pp. 128-129)

Science. Science as a course of study is used in the traditional sense of natural science, defined in Webster (1973) as "any of the sciences (as physics, chemistry, or biology) that deal with matter, energy and their interrelations and transformations or with objectively measurable phenomena."

Scientific method. This is defined as "principles and procedures for the systematic pursuit of knowledge involving the recognition and formulation of a problem, the collection of data through observation and experiment, and the formulation and testing of hypotheses."

Inquiry. This is understood as investigation of a systematic nature.

Limitations of the study. Certain aspects of this study must be limited due to pragmatic considerations of time, physical location of sources, and available fiscal resources. For example, a limited number of interviews will be possible. Also, a fine primary source, the diary of William Kilpatrick, is unfortunately not available to the public. Therefore, generalizations from restricted sources must be guarded.

The sampling of colleges may be biased by the exclusion of those

defunct experimental schools and of others of the time. Therefore, it will be wise to consider such missing data when final interpretation is made, and to indicate what areas may be affected.

Exclusions. The Deweyan model will be a limited model. Aspects which will be treated in less detail than would be warranted in a complete model are (1) the proper perspective on the expressive arts and (2) the importance of moral training.

Reference List

Benezet, L.T. General education in the progressive college. New York: Arno Press, 1971. (Originally published, 1943.)

Cremin, L. The free school movement: A perspective. Notes on Education, 1973, 2, 1-11.

Dewey, J. Sources of a science of education. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1929.

Dewey J. Introduction. The use of resources in education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. Reprinted in Dworkin, M. (Ed.). Dewey on education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959.

Graham, P. Progressive education movement. Encyclopedia of Education, 1971, 7, 249-255.

Smith, T. Progressivism in American education, 1880-1900. Harvard Educational Review, 1961, 31, 167-193.

Webster's new collegiate dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1973.

CHAPTER III

A DEWEYAN EDUCATION

This study is specifically designed to investigate the relationship between Deweyan thought and the progressive education movement as it materialized in higher education. The focus is upon the original design and function of a sample of early "progressive" colleges during the years of planning and the first decade of operation. These colleges will be examined in the light of Deweyan thought. An appropriate instrument for the evaluation of these schools would be a model for education at the college level, based upon Deweyan philosophy. Since most of Dewey's writings on education concentrated on the pre-college years, and since much was in a philosophical rather than a pragmatic mode, an extrapolation on both levels is inevitable. With a suitable model, it should be possible to determine to what extent these "progressive" colleges reflected Deweyan thought in theory and in practice, and to investigate the degree of correlation between these two elements.

The Theoretical Foundation

During the more than sixty years of his professional career, John Dewey devoted much of his attention to education. He believed that the practice of education should be built upon a sound philosophy, and furthermore that educational philosophy was an integral feature of

any philosophical system.[1]

> The philosophy of education is not a poor relation of general philosophy even though it is often so treated even by philosophers. It is ultimately the most significant phase of philosophy. (1938c, p. 471)

> There is probably no better way to realize what philosophy is about when it is living, not antiquarian, than to ask ourselves what criteria and what aims and ideals should control our educational policies and undertakings. . . . The drawing of lines . . . will not only serve to clear up confusion in our educational estate but will tend to breathe life into the dead bones of philosophy. (1944, p. 155)

> Philosophy may even be defined as the general theory of education. (1916a/1966, p. 328)

He incorporated into his educational philosophy the most pressing issues of his times.[2] The commitment of his contemporaries to democracy is reflected in Democracy and Education (1916a). Freedom, which was a major concern of the Populists and Progressives, was a recurrent theme in Dewey's writings; for example, he included a chapter on "The Nature of Freedom" in Experience and Education (1938a). The school was seen by some as a vehicle for ameliorating the social upheaval resulting from industrialization. The introductory pages of The School and Society (1900/1974, pp. 8-11) addressed this notion and supported the idea of the school as an agent of reform. But perhaps more than any other current issue, the correct perspective on science was of crucial concern to Dewey.

---

[1]"On one occasion when asked how it came about that he had turned his attention to educational philosophy, Mr. Dewey replied, 'It was mainly on account of the [his own] children.'" (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936, p. 446)

[2]Levit has reviewed the historical foundations of Dewey's philosophy in "The Context of a Contextualist Philosophy" (1959).

> I regard the philosophy of any period as a reflex of larger and more far-reaching cultural achievements, needs, conflicts and problems. . . . Cultural problems--which ultimately decide important philosophical problems--now centre about the reworking of traditions (institutions, customs, beliefs of all sorts), to bring them into harmony with the potentialities of present science and technology,--here is the setting in which my chief problems have arisen. (1939, pp. 522-523)

Dewey clearly saw the power of the new science and technology and recognized the need to harness it for the good of society.

> The greatest problem facing civilization today . . . is the use which humanity is to make of the instrumentality of science and its related techniques--by far the most powerful instrument for good and evil that mankind has ever known. . . . It has created a new external social environment which reacts upon all the activities of men; it now must face a new responsibility. . . . Human beings are in possession of a perfected powerful tool, and must consider, unless they are to be overwhelmed by the accidental and unplanned operation of the tool, what they are going to do with it, what they are going to use it for. (1931a, p. 6)

> The wounds made by applications of science can be healed only by a further extension of applications and intelligence; like the purpose of all modern healing the application must be preventative as well as curative. This is the supreme obligation of intellectual activity at the present time. (1934, p. 2)

His conception of the proper constitution of education was strongly influenced by his understanding of the pervasive influence of science. Intelligent use of science must stem, Dewey contended, from a public intelligence about science.

The goal for all education--reflective thinking.[3] Dewey turned his attention to this question of science and education in How We Think (1910/1933). In his preface to the first edition, he presented his conviction that the stabilizing factor sorely needed in education at

---

[3]Chapter II in How We Think was entitled "Why Reflective Thinking Must Be an Educational Aim" (p. 17).

that time was a new goal: the development in the student of the scientific attitude of mind. He opined that "the native and unspoiled attitude of childhood, marked by ardent curiosity, fertile imagination, and love of experimental inquiry, is near, very near, the attitude of the scientific mind" (p. v). The inference was that training in reflective thinking would be a natural, rather than an unnatural, education. Dewey further prepared a logical ground for acceptance of this proposal for education as one coherent with everyday experience by describing reflective thought--not as a new way, but--as "the better way" in which man thinks (p. 3). As he spelled out the process of reflective thinking, it became clear that he was using the expression interchangeably with scientific inquiry, or, as he put it, thinking using the methods of science. He distinguished five separate phases in the process of reflective thinking (pp. 107-115).

The pre-reflective stage. Real thought, Dewey postulated, always stemmed from a situation in which a person finds himself in a perplexity or quandry. Something in his environment has presented him with a problem; he must choose an appropriate action. Before reflective thought is initiated, a number of fleeting thoughts may arise. Shall he ignore the difficulty and hope that it solves itself? Shall he fantasize a ready solution; or perhaps retreat from the situation and the stress? Or shall he accept that the problem is real and decide to attempt to face it? This is the point at which reflective thought begins.

The first phase, suggestion. Once the problem has been accepted as one to be faced, the mind of the individual who takes the

reflective route now diverts overt action temporarily. In a sort of dress rehearsal, the person tries out various possible ideas for future action, ranging from the wild guess to more thoughtful suggestion. The collision of these several ideas creates further suspense and the need for further inquiry. An important function of this step in the inhibition of immediate action.

The second phase, intellectualization. Here it is that the emotional aspects of the problem are dominated by the intellectual processes. Now the exact nature of the problem is defined, and separated from the emotional responses. This definition is made by noting exactly the parameters of the conditions that led to the perplexity.

The third phase, the guiding idea, hypothesis. The more logical analysis of the problem done in stage two now allows a re-evaluation of the early spontaneous suggestions and the development of newer and more refined ideas. At this time, suggestion "ceases to be a mere possibility, becoming a tested and, if possible, a measured probability" (pp. 110-111). In other words, a hypothesis is developed, using data collected along the way.

The fourth phase, reasoning (in the narrower sense). Once the hypothesis has been established, a mental elaboration of the implications contained within it will either result in its rejection in light of new relationships observed in the process of extensive investigation; or acceptance, perhaps with new insights into other logical consequents. This process of the mental development of ideas is dependent upon the prior store of knowledge and the experience of the person involved. This in turn rests upon the level of knowledge in the

culture and the means that the culture has for communicating its knowledge to the public. (This appears to be another quiet comment pointing to the need for training the average citizen in the process of reflective thinking.)

The fifth phase, testing the hypothesis by action. Logic requires that if the hypothesis be correct, then certain results must follow. The concluding phase in reflective thought is the arrangement of conditions to ascertain if the logical results accure. On the basis of the tests made, then, the hypothesis may be accepted. If rejected, the process may be repeated, a modified hypothesis generated and retested. In either case, reasoned conclusions are the product.

The post-reflective stage. Once a solution is found, the doubts and perplexities are removed; the successful attack on the problem has proved a "stimulus and a guide to the trained inquirer" (p. 115), rather than the annoyance and discouragement which the unskilled thinker often suffers. (Here again we see a gentle reminder of the advantages of a universal training in scientific inquiry.)

A formal statement of Dewey's theory of inquiry. Dewey described the formal basis for this theory of inquiry, a term which he used interchangeably with "reflective thinking," in Logic--The Theory of Inquiry (1938b/1960). Since any theory of logic must account for inquiry, he chose to make inquiry the common ground for understanding logic. He postulated that logic is a naturalistic theory. Dewey argued that the operations observed in the natural world are not reversed or abandoned in the realm of logic. Neither must new forces, such as Reason, Pure

Intuition, or supernatural powers, be called into existence to account for the process of logical thought. Rather, the continuity of change from lower to higher forms that Darwin confirmed in biological existence must also be existent in the passage from the biological to the logical. There is, he proposed, a biological matrix of inquiry.

Dewey presented inquiry as a developed mode of natural biological behavior (pp. 23-41). His argument is as follows:

(1) A biological organism exists in a balance between its activity and its environment. Dewey defined environment, not as the world at large, but as that part of the natural world that enters directly or indirectly into the life function of the organism. The successful interaction of the organism with the environment results in an equilibrium, which becomes more and more precarious as the organism becomes more differentiated.

In the process of inquiry, environmental conditions and energies are also inherent, and factors involved, such as "doubt, belief, observed qualities and ideas," are related not to "mind" or "self," but to behavior in which "organism and environment . . . inter-act" (p. 33).

(2) "Each particular activity prepares the way for the activity that follows" (p. 27). Dewey emphasized the seriated quality of biological life activities, the passing from one stage of equilibrium, through a time of disequilibrium, to a recovery of the old, or establishment of a new, equilibrium, which may in time, give way to yet another. The state of disequilibrium defines need.

In inquiry, disequilibrium is also the impetus that sets it in

motion. Now it is a perplexity or a quandry that constitutes need.

(3) With the recognition of need, the biological organism changes its exploratory and searching activities; for example, the animal hunts to satisfy his hunger, to restore equilibrium. For most complex organisms, this new activity involves a modification of its old environment and/or changes in its responses to it.[4]

In reflective thinking, modification of the environment and the reaction with it are to be seen in the experimental aspects of inquiry. Even the child pokes and pushes to satisfy his curiosity; the scientist deliberately manipulates conditions to provide data for problem-solving. And as with biological existence, each new activity is built upon prior equilibria in a serial fashion. Past experience is recalled and used in determining the goals (often remote in time and space) of the inquiry that was set in motion by the disequilibrium. Tentative solutions, hypotheses, are developed and tested.

The "serially connected processes and operations by means of which consummatory close" is effected are, in logical thought, "the operations of inference and discourse" leading to final judgment (p. 35). These are found in the phase of inquiry in which an assessment of the logical consequents of the developed hypothesis is made, and the means for the final experimental testing are selected. These complex operations exemplify developed modes of the biological organism's searching and exploratory activities.

---

[4]This bears a close resemblance to Piaget's concept of adaptation--the equilibrium between assimilation and accommodation (Piaget, 1932/1966).

(4) The fulfillment of the need in biological existence is the reestablishment of equilibrium. Hunger is satisfied; the animal rests. In the foraging process, it has changed the environment (which may now contain one less rodent); the animal may well have learned, from its success, new hunting habits.

In inquiry, the solution of the problematic situation, the final judgment, results in a new equilibrium, upon which further inquiry may be instituted. Belief, or assertion, have replaced doubt and perplexity.

Dewey concluded:

> Any thoroughgoing naturalist is . . . committed by the logic of his position to belief in continuity of development, with its corrollary of community of factors in the respective patterns of logical and biological forms and procedures. (p. 41)

Archambault has pointed out that within the description of these phases of reflective thinking is contained all the key elements of Dewey's philosophy.

> It is based in experience. It deals with genuine pressing problems that stem from felt needs. It is characterized by control. Its solutions are tentative but useful. Its method is the method of science. And, like modern science, it not only consists in carefully controlled thought, but aims at control of the environment and improvement of the environment by creative and reflective thought. (1964, p. xvii)

Dewey has, in several contexts, reiterated his position on the crucial importance in education of science and its methods. In "Science, Belief and the Public" he dealt with the rearousal of anti-Darwinian sentiment by the fundamentalists in religion.

> Certainly, from the specialized scientific view, the anti-evolutionary campaign comes about three centuries too late. If it were to affect seriously the course of scientific inquiries, a number of persons should have been strangled in

> their cradles some three hundred years ago. Nevertheless, the issue is for the public actual and vital today. . . . The moral is inevitable. . . . The real issue is not here. It concerns the growing influence of the general public in matters of thought and belief, and the comparative failure of schooling up to the present time to instil even the rudiments of the scientific attitude in vast numbers of persons, so as to enable them to distinguish between matters of mere opinion and argument and those of fact and ascertainment of fact. (1924, pp. 143-144)

In 1934 he spoke of the "Supreme Intellectual Obligations of Scientists,"

> The greatest indictment that can be brought against present civilization, in its intellectual phase, is that so little attention is given to instilling trust in intelligence and eager interest in its active manifestations. . . . It [native intellectual capacity] is now everywhere subordinated to acquisition of special skills and the retention of more or less irrelevant masses of facts and principles--irrelevant, that is, to the formation of the inquiring mind that explores and tests. . . . The chief responsibility for the attainment of a system of education in which the groundwork of a habit and attitude inspired and directed by something akin to the method of science lies with those who already enjoy the benefits of special scientific training. (1934, pp. 3-4)

In his well-known conflict with those who sought to base a college education upon a "five-foot-bookshelf" of Great Books, and who feared that the growing emphasis upon scientific subjects was displacing liberal education, Dewey replied:

> It is argued that science and its method must be subordinated; that we must return to the logic of ultimate first principles expressed in the logic of Aristotle and St. Thomas, in order that the young may have sure anchorage in their intellectual and moral life. . . . If the method of science had ever been consistently and continuously applied throughout the day-by-day work of the school in all subjects, I should be more impressed by this emotional appeal than I am. (1938a/1971, p. 85)

This idea that the methods of science should pervade all areas of education was consistently expressed over the years.

> Education is not exhausted in its intellectual aspect; there are practical attitudes of efficiency to be formed, moral dispositions to be strengthened and developed, esthetic appreciations to be cultivated. But in all these things there is at least an element of conscious meaning and hence of thought. Otherwise, practical activity is mechanical and routine, morals are blind and arbitrary, and esthetic appreciation is sentimental gush. (1910/1933, p. 78)

> Inquiry is the life-blood of every science, and is constantly employed in every art, craft, and profession. (1938b/1960, p. 4)

In summary, it is difficult to deny that the focal point of all education that aspires to be Deweyan must be the inculcation of the scientific attitude of mind--the habits of reflective thinking.

Dewey, in Logic, further pointed out that a naturalistic theory of education must also account for the "extraordinary differences that mark off the activities and achievements of human beings from those of other biological forms" (p. 43). Again, he discarded the a priori postulates or the philosophical retreat to a metaphysical Reason. The chasm between the purely animal and the human is spanned by the agency of the cultural environment which is unique to man. Only man in all the biological world has the power to transmit over time the "traditions, institutions, customs and the purposes and beliefs they both carry and inspire" (p. 43). The "necessary and . . . sufficient condition," he stated, for this cultural transmission is language (p. 46).[5]

Examination of Dewey's thought on language leads to the conclusion that, for him, the second major end of education is a social one. This concept, carried to its logical conclusion, dictates that

---

[5]See Logic (pp. 46-52) for a lengthy definition of language.

education must serve the progressive democracy.[6] The development of the argument begins with inquiry and ends with inquiry (pp. 42-59).

The social aspects of education. It has been established that Dewey held that reflective thinking is a proper goal for education; that it is a developed mode of a natural process. The problems that challenge man to inquiry (the process of reflective thinking) are observed to originate often as an effect of his relationships with other men. The interpretation which a particular man ascribes to his specific dilemma arises then not only from eye-and-ear sense responses, but also from his acculturated reactions. Meanings are colored by his cultural heritage. Since it is language that makes the communication of social values and ideas possible, it is the power of language that creates the world of meaning that coexists with the existential; that embues physical life with intellectual activity; that bridges the emptiness between the biological and the cultural.[7]

> The acquisition and understanding of language with proficiency in the arts (that are foreign to other animals than men) represent an incorporation within the physical structure of human beings of the effects of cultural conditions. . . . To speak, to read, to exercise any art . . . are instances of the modifications wrought within the biological organism by the cultural environment. (Dewey, 1938b/1960, p. 43)

Education, whose mode is communication, whose handmaiden is language, then is properly and inevitably concerned with the social. Dewey intertwined these ideas in a web from which it is difficult to

---

[6] In Experience and Education (1938a/1971), Dewey argues the superiority of the democratic society (pp. 34-35).

[7] Childs (1939, pp. 435-440) has developed this idea in his contribution to The Philosophy of John Dewey, edited by Schilpp.

escape: "Not only is social life identical with communication, but all communication . . . is educative" (1916a/1966, p. 5).

Turning as an example to the developing child, Dewey followed the infant's progress from the purely biological world and noted the development of his uniquely human qualities as he enters into the social life of his culture.

> Beings who are born not only unaware of, but quite indifferent to, the aims and habits of the social group, have to be rendered cognizant of them and actively interested. Education and education alone, spans the gap. (1916a/1966, p. 3)

> Dewey contends that education should be viewed as a social process, because it is by participation in the activities and meanings of society that the child learns the behaviors which are characteristic of person-hood. (Childs, 1939, p. 437)

Moving from the individual to the culture, Dewey pointed out that the preservation of the society rests upon this same process of transmission, of communication with the new generation.

> Without this communication of ideals, hopes, expectations, standards, opinions, from those members of society who are passing out of the group life to those who are coming into it, social life could not survive. (Dewey 1916a/1966, p. 3)

Dewey, then, has justified his definition of education "in its broadest sense, as the means of the social continuity of life" (p. 2). In his view, it follows that if education is to concern itself with the society, with the transmission of the cultural heritage, it is specifically the democratic society with which education must identify. His argument for a preference for the democratic way of life transcends patriotism and habitual thinking.

> The question is concerned with the reconciliation of national loyalty, of patriotism, with the superior devotion to the things which unite men in common ends, irrespective of national political boundaries. (1916a/1966, p. 98)

It is based upon the conviction that democracy provides a better life for mankind.

> Can we find any reason that does not ultimately come down to the belief that democratic social arrangements promote a better quality of human experience, one which is more widely accessible and enjoyed, than do non-democratic and anti-democratic forms of social life? Does not the principle of regard for individual freedom and for decency and kindliness of human relations come back in the end to the conviction that these things are tributary to a higher quality of experience on the part of a greater number than are methods of repression and coercion? Is not the reason for our preference that we believe that mutual consultation and convictions reached through persuasion, make possible a better quality of experience than can otherwise be provided on any wide scale? (1938a/1971, p. 34) [Underlining added.]

Dewey then pointed out the coherence of the ideals of progressive education with the goals of democracy--the emphasis upon a similar "discrimination . . . between the inherent values of different experiences" (p. 35). Progressive education, like democracy, is built upon past experience, growing as it experiences. It is the continuity of experiences that provides the basis for discrimination, for the choices made.

Archambault (1964) has remarked that "democracy and science come closest to being the only absolutes in Dewey's experimentalist philosophy" (pp. xvii-xviii). He described the continuity between the two, between reflective thought and the principles of democracy.

> It was not only the actual content and method of science that interested, and indeed preoccupied Dewey, but the connotations that were associated with science; objectivity, honesty, freedom, open-endedness. Philosophy was to follow the spirit of science, not only in its approach to the problems of metaphysics and epistemology, but also in the fields of ethics and aesthetics. There was to be one major mode of knowing which could be applied consistently in all areas of thought. If this were to be done

> it would obviously require a political structure that would in itself be an implementation of the scientific mode of thought. Dewey saw democracy as the political manifestation of scientific method. (p. xvii)

Baker (1955/1966, p. 69) referred, as did many others, to Dewey as the philosopher of democracy. He detailed Dewey's early interest in democracy and his use of science for support of his particular concept of democracy.

> Dewey's democracy means that each unique personality is of incomparable worth and shall share equally in the good; he shall share, not only in the good as an end, but also in the means of creating the good. All of his experiences are included with those of all his fellows as having an ethical bearing. The sovereignty implicit in this community of ethical experience needs methods of specific operation for its expression. The social motor that can provide this direction is science, science that means to know from the standpoint of humanity. (pp. 76-77)

This emphasis in Dewey's thought upon the interplay between the individual and democracy, between communication and community, between democracy and education, ties together the two principal goals of education. The ability to inquire; to undertake reflective thinking, liberates man; his participation in his democracy confers upon him personhood. The progressive democracy develops and evolves as its citizens exercise intelligent inquiry--and thus the argument closes its circle. Dewey has proceeded from inquiry resulting from need, defined in part by the culture, to education designed to preserve and improve that culture. In its ideal form, that society will be a dynamic and progressive democracy, whose evolution is dependent upon the individual and his ability to inquire profitably. The everlasting cycle is from inquiry to inquiry, in a spiraling progression that reflects a consistent faith in man and in the power of education.

Dewey encapsulated this sequence of thought when he called for a better understanding of education "as a freeing of individual capacity in a progressive growth directed to social aims" (1916a/1966, p. 98).

The two cornerstones for a progressive view of education are thus defined. Education has a dual responsibility. It must serve both the individual and the society. Yet in no way does this constitute a dualism. There should never have developed the vigorous controversy that was carried on in the realm of progressive education between the child-centered educators and those opposed to their practices. Archambault wrote:

> The central role of the pupil becomes clear. He is the purpose for which the educational enterprise exists. Since democracy receives its impetus from creative individuals, the contribution of education consists in the development of free, imaginative and creative individuals. (1964, p. xxvi)

But a hidden obstacle lay in wait for the progressive educator. It was the interpretation of a "free" individual. Much of the early discord that arose over progressive education centered upon this question of freedom, of the proper role of the child.

Freedom and education. Dewey stated his position on this issue consistently and often over the years. A detailed discussion can be found in an article, "What is Freedom" (1922/1964, pp. 81-88). Here he factored out the three elements which he felt were contained in the concept of freedom.

(1) There is an ability to act, to put plans into action. This implies that insurmountable obstacles to efficient action are absent.

(2) There is a potential for flexible action, for changing plans, for novelty in experience.

(3) There is an element of desire and choice, with power to influence events.

Having stated what he thought freedom was, Dewey clarified what what he thought it was not. It is not a metaphysical freedom of will. However, he continued, there is a "certain natural freedom" possessed by man, to the extent that a harmony exists between "a man's energies and his environment," a harmony that supports him and enables him to carry out his plans. Without such natural support, no legislation can provide true liberty. Freedom is also not merely freedom from "oppressive legal and political measures." Neither is it emancipation from all organization. Rather, man voluntarily exchanges part of his natural, often capricious, freedom for the security offered by a social organization. This he does in a flexible and experimental manner, constantly seeking the proper balance between the limitations imposed by organization and the privileges of his natural freedom (pp. 83-84).

Freedom is also not "a freedom of indifference," a power to choose this way or that "apart from any habit or impulse." But choice is an important aspect of freedom. "Variety is more than the spice of life; it is largely of its essence, making a difference between the free and the enslaved" (p. 85). Darwinian science had given credence to a theory of a continuity of change in Nature, thereby allowing a world of genuine possibilities, without which the idea of change becomes meaningless.

> To foresee future objective alterations and to be able by deliberation to choose one of them and thereby weight its chances in the struggle for future existence measures our freedom . . . They [deliberation and choice] give us all the control of future possibilities which is open to us. And this control is the crux of our freedom. (1922/1964, p. 87)

This theme is clarified in the passage below:

> Genuine freedom, in short, is intellectual; it rests in the trained power of thought, in ability to "turn things over," to look at matters deliberately. . . . If a man's actions are not guided by thoughtful conclusions, then they are guided by inconsiderate impulse, unbalanced appetite, caprice, or the circumstances of the moment. To cultivate unhindered, unreflective external activity is to foster enslavement. (1910/1933, p. 90)

The relationship between freedom and Dewey's goals for education now stand in sharp outline. If freedom is the ability to control one's life and circumstances by the agent of "trained thought," by intelligent deliberation and choice, in short, by reflective thought; and if education elects as its goal the inculcation of scientific attitudes of thought, then it is this education that sets men free.

In the constructs of this philosophy, freedom is something achieved by the student; it is the power to act productively. Dewey directly attacked certain progressive interpretations of his own emphasis upon the child, upon the importance of preserving his individuality, and of his insistence upon a new freedom in education for the student. Dewey wished to abolish the old authoritarian approach to education, the rote learning, the recitation system, the use of subject matter unrelated to the real life of the student. But the progressive extremists' alternative was also, he proposed, contrary to what was known about how learning takes place.

> The proponents of freedom are in a false position as well as the would-be masters and dictators. There is a present tendency in so-called advanced schools of educational thought . . . to say, in effect, let us surround pupils with certain materials, tools, appliances, etc., and then let pupils respond to these things according to their own desires. Above all let us not suggest any end or plan to the students; let us not suggest to them what they shall do, for that is an unwarranted trespass upon their sacred intellectual individuality since the essence of such individuality is to set up ends and aims.
>
> Now such a method is really stupid. (Dewey, 1929a, p. 179)

Earlier he had written: "Guidance is not external imposition. It is freeing the life process for its most adequate fulfillment" (1902a/1974, p. 17).

These issues will resurface in the study of the sample colleges, where individuality and self-direction of education, balanced, at least in theory, with strong counseling systems, are key elements of educational philosophy. (See also the discussions below in "The Question of Structure" and "Specialization.")

Dewey wrote again in 1936:

> The problem of the relation between individual freedom and collective well-being is today urgent and acute, perhaps more so than at any time in the past. The problem of achieving both of these values without the sacrifice of either one is likely to be the dominant problem of civilization for many years to come. (p. xv)

Boyd Bode, an eloquent exponent of John Dewey's educational philosophy, (and a powerful force in the establishment of Goddard College) pointed out that education which interpreted educational freedom in light of Rousseau's view that the child must grow in his own way, without "imposition" by others, allowing thus his "own inherent nature" to emerge, was practicing a new form of absolutism.

> This is absolutism all over again. If we may trust the findings of modern psychology and the social sciences, it is just as impossible to find educational objectives by inspecting the individual child as it is by looking for them in a transcendental realm. The most that the study of childhood can reveal is the nature of the raw material with which we have to work. If we expect such study to produce an educational program, then, no matter how excellent our intentions may be, the interests of democracy are bound to suffer. A democratic program of education must necessarily rest upon the perception that democracy is a challenge to all forms of absolutism, that it has its own standards, ideals, and values, and that these must pervade the entire program from end to end.
>
> It is precisely at this point that progressive education is in the doldrums. . . . The faith of progressive education in the individual, and in the power of intelligence to create new standards and ideals in terms of human values and in accordance with changing conditions, entitles it to consideration as expressive of the spirit of democracy. As against this, however, stands the fact that it has never completely emancipated itself from the individualism and absolutism of Rousseau. Instead of turning to the ideal of democracy for guidance, it has all too often turned to the individual. . . . The futility of this is reflected in the excresences that have grown up about the movement. (Bode, 1938, pp. 39-40)

The difficulties which progressive educators experienced in translating Dewey's concepts of individuality and freedom were not the sole examples of misunderstandings of Dewey's philosophy. There was, and still is, confusion about what Dewey meant by scientific method, about its usefulness in various areas of educational concern. Dewey understood that many educators and philosophers had serious reservations, often based upon an inadequate comprehension of his definition of science and scientific method,

> I am aware that the emphasis I have placed upon scientific method may be misleading, for it may result only in calling up the special technique of laboratory research as that is conducted by specialists. But the meaning of the emphasis placed upon scientific method has little to do with specialized techniques. It means that scientific method is the only authentic means at our command for getting at the significance of our everyday experiences of the world in which we live. . . .

> Consequently, whatever the level of experience, we have no choice but either to operate in accord with the pattern it provides [formation of ideas, acting upon ideas, observation of the conditions that result, and organization of facts and ideas for future use] or else to neglect the place of intelligence in the development and control of a living and moving experience. (1938a/1971, pp. 87-88)

Over the years he wrote many careful expositions on the general applicability of scientific thinking in areas other than the purely scientific: in common sense thinking, in making practical judgements, in value determination. Chapter Nine in The Quest for Certainty (1929c) was directed to this point and provides a suitable title for the next section of this paper.

"The Supremacy of Method." Dewey had no doubt that the method of inquiry which he had extracted from the scientific world would serve generally in his pursuit of his goals for education. It has been pointed out previously that Dewey contended that this method of thinking was not foreign to man, but represented the manner in which he characteristically did his finest thinking. He argued that there was, in fact, not the significant gap between common sense and scientific inquiry that was often postulated; a split sometimes presented as the "opposition of the qualitative to the non-qualitative; largely, but not exclusively the quantitative"; at other times described as the difference between "perceptual and conceptual material and a system of conceptual construction" (1938b/1960, p. 65). As might be expected from this constant advocate of continuity and the steadfast foe of dualisms, Dewey forged a logical unity between the two--between common sense and science (pp. 60-80).

Common sense and science. Defining the common sense world as the environment with which each of us is directly involved, Dewey presented common sense inquiries as those which are connected with the problems faced in the interaction between the individual and his environment; problems dealing with the "use and enjoyment" (p. 63) of the existential surroundings. In contrast, scientific inquiries pursue knowledge, not just for use and enjoyment, but for its own sake (pp. 60-61). But rather than an opposition between these two processes, there is an obvious unity: in both cases inquiry is initiated by the emergence of a problem, an indeterminant situation. The problems differ in their subject matter; the process of successful inquiry is the same. But even here, Dewey pointed out yet another interrelationship. Scientific inquiries, no matter how sophisticated, arose originally from real world problems. Science has also used and modified early common sense methods to fit its peculiar needs. The solutions of science in turn have been incorporated into the common sense world, refining and enhancing its habitual methods of inquiry. Seen in this light, scientific subject matter is then intermediate, not consummatory. Science is dialectical, not arbitrary. Constantly reacting to its own solutions, elaborating its own techniques, it often chooses problems so unintelligible to the non-scientist that it appears remote from the common sense world. Yet its roots are there; it takes from and gives to the world of practical existence.

Confusion in the educational world as to what science is, what it does, contributed to the long delay in incorporating science into the curriculum of higher education (Brubacher & Rudy, 1958/1976;

Butts, 1939), to the battles fought between advocates of vocational and cultural education.[8] Fear of science, fed by the evils which had come with its applications in the industrialization of America led to a hostility towards it as a disrupter of the familiar society (Hofstadter, 1955, Wiebe, 1967), as a destroyer of religious values (Krutch, 1929/1956). Dewey sought to dismantle such constructs, to replace them with the idea of science as a process of inquiry, never complete, never arriving at absolute truth, always instituting new inquiry upon the conclusions of the old.

The lack of general agreement as to what constitues science still hampers its functioning in education. Bronowski, in The Common Sense of Science (1961), espoused a view close to Dewey's.

> Science does not consist only of finding the facts, nor is it enough to think, however rationally. The processes of science are characteristic of human action in that they move by the union of empirical fact and rational thought, in a way that can not be disentangled. There is in science, as in all our lives, a continuous to and fro of factual discovery, then of thought about the implications of what we have discovered, and so back to the facts for testing and discovery--a step by step of experiment and theory, left, right, left, right, for ever. (p. 36)

Others, such as Popper (1963) and Schwab (1963) also have described the dialectical nature of science, but this concept has not been universally held.[9]

---

[8] See Hutchins (1936), The Higher Learning in America, for the arguments for classical education, and Dewey, The Educational Situation, (1902b/1969), for an opposite viewpoint.

[9] Thelen, in an unpublished paper, "Perceptions of Science," has collected six pages of quotations, samples of definitions of science published between 1953 and 1972. The Bronowski excerpt used above was included (Note 1).

Dewey furthered his discussion of the unity of science and common sense by a study of the logic involved in practical judgements, relating this logic to scientific judgements, and extrapolating it to judgements of value (Dewey, 1916). Since this theory has important implications for the building of the theoretical Model, it is pursued below.

Logic of practical judgements. By practical judgements, Dewey meant a kind of judgement having as subject matter propositions relating to agenda, requiring action. Such judgements, common to daily life, exhibit certain characteristics.

(1) The judgements concern a problematic situation. The subject matter is as "yet unterminated, unfinished or not wholly given" (p. 506). That is to say, a future is implied.

(2) The proposition is itself a factor in the resolution of the problem. The judgement to take a specified action determines the shape of the outcome.

(3) The quality of the judgement affects the outcome. Since one outcome is probably preferred over another, the securing of the better outcome rests upon the nature of the proposition made.

(4) Practical judgements than are binary. Propositions made to resolve the problematic situation constitute both ends and means. Definition of the problem--identification of the subject matter--leads to the selection of the preferred end, the desired outcome. Choice of possible actions to be taken, also part of the practical judgement, establishes the means for attaining the preferred end. This inseparability of means and ends, Dewey insists, condemns utopianism and

romanticism (from the side of ends), and materialism and predetermination (from the side of means). Inherent in his theory is the possibility of change, in line with Darwinian science.

(5) To be productive, practical judgements depend upon an accurate assessment of the problematic situation, the subject matter.

(6) The truth or falsity of the practical judgement, the perception of the judgement as good or bad, is determined only by the results of the proposed action. Until acted upon, the proposition is only a hypothesis. And Dewey adds, "only the issue gives the complete subject-matter" (p. 510). The outcome also sheds new light upon the nature of the original problematic situation. Successful outcome suggests that the analysis of the problem was accurate. Irrelevant action resulting in failure to obtain the desired outcome indicates unsuccessful interpretation of the subject matter.

At this point, Dewey returned to the relationship discussed above between scientific thinking and practical judgements, between science and common sense. But the focus of the paper shifted to the consideration of value judgements, using the theories developed in the prior areas.

The congruence of value judgements with practical judgements. Practical judgements, Dewey has said, have as subject-matter agenda, things to be done, related to the "use and enjoyment" of the existential surroundings. Science has, it has been shown, different subject-matter--knowledge for its own sake. But scientific judgements as to the "truth or falsity" of scientific information or principles depend, as do practical judgements, upon the framing of a hypothesis, the

selecting of actions to be tried, and a reliance upon tested consequents to determine the value of the scientific judgement. Dewey also proposed that each of the characteristics outlined for practical judgements apply as well to value judgements.

Judgements of value have, it is true, still different subject-matter--"goods and bads." They constitute, not a new entity, but only a special case of practical judgements. Like practical judgements, they arise from indeterminant situations. They call for action and imply that "value is not anything as yet given, but is something to-be-given by future action, itself conditional upon (varying with) the judgement" (p. 514). Value judgements deal with the action appropriate for the resolution of the problematic situation; the determination of good and bad derives from the outcome of the action.

Such a theory of values, or--as Dewey preferred--valuation, has far-reaching implications. A priori values--rights and wrongs--are discarded. Value becomes a practical and existential consideration. Good and bad find its ground in action, dependent upon judgements made. Values then become choices--results of evaluation, using, of course the methods of science, the techniques of practical and scientific judgements. The end-in-view for judgements of value is the adequate means of doing.

It is apparent that the emphasis is upon action. Dewey said, "While man lives, he never is called upon to judge whether he shall act, but simply how he shall act" (p. 519). The outcomes of his chosen actions define his values. Rucker wrote:

> Dewey points out that ethics has been regarded as a branch of philosophy, as a science, and as an art. It is evident that he considers scientific ethics central, since it will relieve philosophic ethics from its dependence upon fixed values and standards and relieve ethics as an art from its search for specific rules of conduct, replacing both set ideals and rules with methods for analysis of moral problems. (Rucker, 1970, p. 113)

This emphasis upon a science of ethics, upon the determination of values by the same method used to establish scientific knowledge, was part of Dewey's long attempt to solve one of the problems of his society that he considered crucial--the proper use for good of science, the value judgements necessary for making science work for society (See pp. 23-24). His plan for action was the development of an understanding of the common process by which solutions to varying problems should be attempted, the process of reflective thinking, using the methods of science.

The implications for education. At this point, the logic of this study leads back to Dewey's two main goals for education. He has presented his theory that the process of reflective thinking is involved in all aspects of life, from every-day decision making, to the gaining of scientific knowledge, to value formation. It should then be a major goal of education, pervading the entire philosophy and curriculum of the school and the college. It should involve student, faculty, and administration alike. It implies activity on the part of the learner, as he engages in genuine inquiry based upon real problems. A new conception of the role of the individual in education thus appears, and of the nature of education itself.

> In education . . . the main point is not so much to get certain acts done, as to induce in the child certain ways of valuing acts, from which the performance of the specific deeds will naturally follow. (Dewey, 1894/1970, p. 2)

There are as well implications for the social goals of education. If change is, as assumed, possible; if the object of judgements is to effect change; then judgements as to how education should be conducted must rest upon the changes to be effected. Again a continuity of means and ends results. When the emphasis shifts from the individual to the society, the urgent problem becomes that of the balance between the preferred outcomes for the student and those of his community. If he is taught to value by the process of inquiry, he is then better prepared to evaluate his role in society, to determine his responsibility in his world, to weigh the good and the bad, to change his society. Further explication of these inferences drawn for education will follow in the development of the Model.

It is interesting to take note of a publication of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, which said in part:

> The spirit underlying science and technology [rational inquiry] provides two . . . profound benefits: increased individuality and increased brotherhood of men. The promise of increased individuality derives from the very essence of the spirit of science. This spirit can enable each person to free himself from blind obedience to the dictates of his emotions, of propaganda, of group pressures, of the authority of others. . . . The deeper workings of the spirit of science are creating . . . a general commonality of values, a sort of spiritual unity among men. . . . In the past, this goal has usually been through some community of values peculiar to a small group. . . . Today, however, the values on which science and technology are based are gaining acceptance in the most diverse cultures. In this respect, spread of the spirit of science . . . might represent

> a movement toward genuine similarities of belief, thought, and action. . . . We conclude . . . that a general worldwide fostering of the spirit of science is wise. This conclusion has implications for the American school and for foreign policy. (1966, pp. 11-13)

Apparently Dewey's philosophy is still at work. This statement echoes the broad hopes that Dewey entertained for a wide-spread familiarity with the spirit of science, with the process of inquiry.

Construction of the Model

The theoretical foundations for the construction of the Model have been laid. There remains the task of extrapolating Dewey's theories to the level of higher education; of drawing inferences from his philosophy where necessary; of extending general concepts to the specific applications in education. The Model has developed, under this treatment, into two distinct sections. It is proposed that the Model specify two main goals for a Deweyan education. The implications of these goals, and of the Deweyan philosophy upon which each rests, provide four essential characteristics which should be inherent in the philosophy and the practice of the Deweyan college. The sections below identify these goals and characteristics and justify their choice.

Teaching reflective thinking. Many of the preceeding pages in this chapter have been dedicated to establishing the fact that Dewey held that a major goal of education should be to provide every student with the power to think reflectively, to inquire using the methods of science. Recalling his insistence that ends and means are inseparable, that a judgement that there is a preferred outcome includes the route

to the securing of that outcome, one must then not simply say that skill in inquiry is the goal of education. One must say that certain action is planned in order to reach the desired goal of skill in scientific thinking. Therefore, two proposals are made.

Science as subject matter. It would not be illogical to suggest that science, properly taught, might well be the most effective vehicle for teaching scientific method. It could serve efficiently as a means to this end for which the College (the Deweyan college) purports to function. It also, anticipating now the second goal for education--the social aspects of education--would serve as a means to that end as well. By extending Dewey's thought on elementary education, still holding to his view of education as the development of the power of reflective thinking to be used for the betterment of society, one may quite logically present an argument for at least this specific area of subject-matter as integral to a Deweyan education. That any educated person should have a firm understanding, not only of the methods of science, but also of its role in the formation of society, past and future, is a concept clearly espoused in Dewey's writings.

Dewey has characterized science in several ways:

> Science signifies, I take it, the existence of systematic methods of inquiry, which, when they are brought to bear on a range of facts, enable us to understand them better and to control them more intelligently, less haphazardly, and with less routine. (1929b, pp. 8-9)

> Science represents the office of intelligence, in projection and control of new experiences, pursued systematically, intentionally, and on a scale due to freedom from limitations of habit. It is the sole instrumentality of conscious, as distinct from accidental, progress. (1916a/1966, p. 228)

> By science is meant . . . that knowledge which is the outcome of methods of observation, reflection, and testing which are deliberately adopted to secure a settled, assured subject matter. . . . Science is the perfecting of knowing, its last stage. (1916a/1966, p. 219) [Underlining added.]

There are several more points upon which to base a proposal that Dewey would expect that a college graduate be versed in the facts and methods of science. He has presented pertinent arguments in Experience and Education (1938a/1971, pp. 79-83). Pointing out that physical science was responsible for most of the style of life enjoyed by individuals of his day in terms of transportation, electricity, variety of food, indeed even to the nature of the relationships between human beings, he drew the conclusion that "it is impossible to obtain an understanding of present social forces (without which they cannot be mastered and directed) apart from an education which leads learners into knowledge of the very same facts and principles which in their final organization constitute the sciences" (pp. 80-81). He then proceeded beyond the realm of the present, toward a better world beyond.

> Nor does the importance of the principle that learners should be led to acquaintance with scientific subject-matter cease with the insight thereby given into present social issues. The methods of science also point the way to measures and policies by means of which a better social order can be brought into existence. (p. 81) [Underlining added.]

Dewey did not limit the educational role of science to the present or to the future.

> One who is ignorant of the history of science is ignorant of the struggle by which mankind has passed from routine, from caprice, from superstitious subjection to nature, from efforts to use it magically, to intelligent self-possession. (1916a/1966, pp. 228-229)

Dewey referred to the specific problem of the role of science in the college curriculum, a much debated issue at that time, in The Educational Situation (1902b/1969, pp. 86-92). Here he pointed out, not only that "sciences are the outcome of all that makes modern life what it is" (p. 86), but that the sciences grew out of human needs. Therefore, they have a justifiable claim for inclusion in any education which has social concerns. To critics who saw the "new" sciences only as a heavy burden of new information, he replied that instead science represented a change in standpoint, a "profound modification and reconstruction of all attained knowledge" (pp. 87-88). Scientific method, he explained, has invaded all fields of knowledge--it is inescapable. It has in addition spawned other new areas to challenge the classicists. History, sociology, political science all represent "fundamental values of human life" (p. 89); and all thus have their claim on curriculum. Dewey felt that this problem called for organization as the only solution. Until, he said, the relationships of various branches of human learning have been worked out, there will continue to be this "happy" ferment over curriculum at the college level (p. 91). In the meantime, the criteria for the correct choice of subject-matter must reside in the "supreme end" of college education. To Dewey, for whom education was the inculcation of the methods of science to be used in the furtherance of the democratic society, a knowledge of scientific methods and facts was not an arguable good, but a fundamental necessity.

Mayhew and Edward's record of the Dewey School provides data as to the method of implementation of Dewey's theories in this regard.

The primacy of science throughout its years of operation is evident; the evidence of flexibility of methods used proves to be invaluable in extrapolating to the college level.

Beginning with the youngest child, continuing on to the highest level, "scientific method was the constantly used tool . . . By common consent, it was the method at all times and in all situations where . . . active investigations . . . could be carried on" (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936, p. 271). The first exposure to science was indirect, designed to fit the level of experience of the child, and then there was a systematical movement from "a social and human center toward a more objective intellectual scheme of organization," the ultimate goal being "the organized subject-matter of the adult and the specialist" (1938a/1971, p. 83). Dewey held that the early introduction to science should be through the common everyday activities of the child (p. 80). For example, according to Mayhew and Edwards, the faculty of the Laboratory School chose cooking as one tool for presenting a wide range of scientific concepts--the physical and chemical changes effected by water and heat, an experimental approach to a perfect pudding, or the mathematics involved in adjusting a recipe. The cooking program began in kindergarten. It continued as part of the curriculum until it was supplanted by the need to prepare for college preparatory examinations. The actual content studied was varied with the age of the class, beginning with the preparation of simple cereals, progressing to the experimental study of nutrition and hygiene for the more advanced. At all stages, generalizations appropriate to the level of experience were attempted. The focus was an "interest in and appreciation of the

value of organized and classified knowledge, again not for its own sake, but for its . . . use in . . . more mature investigation and research" (p. 273).

To extrapolate this process to the college level, one needs only to follow the course laid down. Had Dewey's experiment continued, his students would have moved to a direct study of science, probably in the specialized areas such as chemistry or physics, according to the individual's need and interests. By the time the Dewey School closed, two groups had actually embarked upon the study of specialized scientific topics--general biology, selected aspects of physics, and mathematics (p. 238). If the elementary school student were to do "consecutive work in gardening, cooking, or weaving . . . so planned that it will inevitably result in . . . amassing information of practical and scientific importance in biology, zoology, chemistry, physics and other sciences" as well as increasing his skill in inquiry (1910/1933, p. 217), then the college student must surely continue his investigations in this area, to enter into the world of the specialist.

To repeat: "Science is the perfecting of knowing, its last stage" (Dewey, 1916a/1966, p. 219).

There remains one major facet of this topic of science as subject-matter, an aspect that relates to the general principles involving the method of teaching. Turning again to How We Think (1910/1933, pp. 79-85), one encounters the now familiar contrast of process versus product. Dewey pointed out there that learning can be presented as mere information, in which case it is "an undigested burden" (p. 78), or education can strive to develop good habits of thinking. Emphasis

upon the products of past thought, presented to the student with a ready-made organization, does indeed represent the imposition of external authority unless such material is appropriate to the student's experience. For the young child, whose natural inclincation is toward experiment and inference, such an approach is not educative, but stultifying. The true educative process should be one that preserves and refines these innate creative and fertile tendencies of the child into "expert, tested powers" (p. 84). For the college student, it may be inferred that the function of education is still "cultivating the attitude of reflective thinking, preserving it where it already exists, and changing looser methods of thought into stricter ones wherever possible" (p. 78). In addition, it is now that the student whose earlier education has been along the lines that Dewey has drawn may be ready to utilize an organized body of knowledge such as biology or physics for fulfillment of needs of his own. But even at this stage, Dewey suggests that the traditional presentation has serious failings.

> Since the mass of pupils are never going to become scientific specialists, it is much more important that they should get some insight into what scientific method means than that they should copy . . . the results which scientific men have reached. . . . It is safe to say that the few who go on to be scientific experts will have a better preparation than if they had been swamped with a large mass of purely technical . . . information. In fact, those who become successful men of science are those who by their own power manage to avoid the pitfalls of a traditional scholastic introduction to it. (1916a/1966, p. 221) [Underlining added.]

Dewey stressed that the problem lies in the separation of science from experience. When science is treated only in the abstract, it, more than any other body of knowledge, presents a danger to education. Its value to the individual and to society lies not in its

organization alone, but in the application of its content in the "specialized conduct of the enterprise of discovery" (p. 190). In addition, the presentation of scientific subjects must be extended to include its social aspects.

> If . . . concern with these technical subject matters has been connected with human activities having social breadth, the range of active responses called into play and flexibly integrated is much wider. Isolation of subject matter from a social context is the chief obstruction in current practice to securing a general training of mind. (1916a/1966, p. 67)

Indeed, the controversy over the role of science in the liberal arts college, the clash between cultural and the technical courses, can be resolved by "seeing to it that the technical subjects which are now socially necessary acquire a humane direction" (1946, p. 87).

> Science should be taught so as to be an end in itself in the lives of students--something worth while on account of its own unique contribution to the experience of life. (1916a/1966, pp. 240-241)

Implementation of this basic principle has not been clearly spelled out. In The Way Out of Education Confusion (1931/1970, pp. 30-32), Dewey suggested, for pre-college students, the use of a project method to break down the barriers between traditional areas of study. This method found wide application in the Laboratory School. For the college student, Dewey believed that technical vocational study could indeed free and liberalize the mind if the inherent cultural aspects were included, thereby thinning the walls between specific subject matters.

Many interpretations of this concept have been offered in the form of such courses as "Unified Science," "General Science," and survey courses of some variety. For all applications, as one might anticipate,

Dewey reminded us that "the test and justification . . . is found in observable consequences, not in an a priori dogma" (1946, p. 83).

In summary, it is proposed that a knowledge of scientific facts, principles, and methods occupies a central position in an education which purports to be Deweyan. The manner in which this knowledge is acquired may vary considerably. However, it is suggested that a self-conscious concern with scientific method is appropriate for the College and that this is most directly encountered in the study of science itself. Since even non-scientists become teachers, parents, and citizens and as such must pass on the powerful tool of inquiry to students, children, and compatriots, it is imperative that a systematic understanding of its working be acquired. Because every-day life is intricately enmeshed in the effects of science in both practical and social aspects, some familiarity with the technical facts and principles is also essential for understanding one's existential surroundings. On such grounds, it is proposed that a requirement for the study of science is appropriate in the College, which is dedicated to the two goals of education projected by John Dewey.

Additional expectations. A strong argument has been made for a formal requirement that each student be expected to gain an understanding of both the methods and the facts of science. In addition, it is proposed that in a Deweyan educational system, reflective thinking would be generally taught, formally or informally, in all the other academic areas. Fields related to science, such as social studies or psychology, would lend themselves readily to a formal incorporation of the methods and techniques of science. Out-of-classroom activities

such as individual study or research, properly supervised, could serve to familiarize the student with the concepts of scientific inquiry. For example, the Senior Project, popular in the progressive colleges, could be an effective instrument. Even less-likely subject matter, however, should have a conscious focus upon the teaching of inquiry. As Dewey used cooking, weaving, and other activities tied to social occupations, so must the Deweyan college teach history, literature, even art and music with the underlying goal of improving the ability to think reflectively.

One then might logically expect to find explicit in the statements of aims and goals of the Deweyan College a dedication to the development of reflective thought. One ought also to see a variety of curricula focused around differing subject matters, but all with a common element--the development within the student of the power to inquire.

The social aspects of education. Dewey's treatment of this topic in his Logic has been examined above. A more detailed and pragmatic exposition can be found in Democracy and Education, where he thoroughly explored its implications. The emphasis was put upon an education which would not only develop a scientific attitude of mind but also encourage the growth of the student into an "effective competent member" of the society (1916a/1966, p. 67). This concept underlies all areas of Dewey's concerns for education.

Dewey stressed that the complexity of modern society resulted in a wide disparity between the abilities of its young members and the

mature citizen. Informal education that has been in the past effective in transmitting values and knowledge no longer can adequately merge the different generations. The need for formal education thus becomes, not a luxury, but a necessity, not as a replacement for the informal, but as an adjunct to it. Dewey suggested that traditional education, in its development of the formal, had adopted techniques with dangerous consequences. It had separated the "subject matter of the schools . . . from the subject matter of life experience" (p. 8). In the process, the value of education to society was much diminished. A balance must, he said, be maintained between the formal and the informal, and the social aspects of education must be kept in the forefront.

Assuming then that a major goal for education was to mature society's immature members, Dewey sought to establish fundamental principles for the educator. He made several major assumptions, often at odds with some current educational thought of his time. For one, the child was seen as naturally "and chiefly interested upon the whole, in entering into the activities of others and taking part in conjoint and cooperative doings" (p. 24)--an eager applicant for acceptance into the society. Another assumption of crucial importance was that the child was innately active.

> We do not have to draw out or educe positive activities from a child, as some educational doctrines would have it. Where there is life, there are already impassioned activities. (p. 42) [Underlining added.]

The role of the teacher, at any level then, is only to direct the natural tendencies of the student, to shape him/her in the "standard form of social activity" (p. 10).

Dewey was emphatic in stating that this could not be done by external control. All the school could do, he explained, was to provide an environment which sets up conditions encouraging certain ways of acting, using as much as possible the framework of a group (p. 14). The school should function as a "special social environment" which would promote healthy growth (p. 22).

Clearly Dewey was convinced that education, as it fostered growth, was to be guided by a common concern for the society, the transformation of the young into responsible members of the democracy. The use of "conjoint activities" (p. 40) was to be encouraged in order that the learner might gain a "social sense" of his own power and of the educative materials.

When Dewey turned from general theoretical considerations towards the topic of curriculum and specific subject matters, he reinforced his emphasis upon the social aspects of education. All subject matter could and should be taught with an eye to its relationship to the broader society. In his Laboratory School, for example, he used the study of occupations as the framework for introducing various subject matter. The value of the content of subject matter was not, however, to be ignored. He declared that "organized subject matter . . . represents the ripe fruitage of experiences" of the society (p. 182), and of course, education hopes to use the experience of the past to promote a new and better society. "From the standpoint of the educator . . . the various studies represent working resources, available

capital."[10]

Dewey presented examples of his conception of the proper treatment of subject matter. For example, defining geography as an account of the earth as the home of man (p. 211), he described its proper study in this manner:

> Sunlight, air, running water, inequality of earth's surface, varied industries, civil officers and their duties--all these things are found in the local environment. Treated as if their meaning began and ended in those confines, they are curious facts to be laboriously learned. As instruments for extending the limits of experience, bringing within its scope peoples and things otherwise strange and unknown, they are transfigured by the use to which they are put. Sunlight, wind, stream, commerce, political relations come from afar and lead the thoughts afar. To follow their course is to enlarge the mind not by stuffing it with additional information, but by remaking the meaning of what was previously a matter of course. (p. 212)

In a similar vein, he regarded history as integral to the present.

> The past just as past is no longer our affair. If it were wholly gone and done with, there would be only one reasonable attitude toward it. Let the dead bury their dead. But knowledge of the past is the key to understanding the present. History deals with the past, but this past is the history of the present. (p. 214)

And again--the study of science was presented as essential to a progressive society.

> The problem of an educational use of science is then to create an intelligence pregnant with belief in the possibility of the direction of human affairs by itself. The method of science engrained through education in habit means emancipation from rule of thumb. (p. 225)

---

[10]This logic is consistent with the notion that a Deweyan College would indeed, as outlined below, expect to establish curriculum requirements calling for a balanced choice of subject matter, a core of studies that would provide the student with the knowledge necessary for the understanding of his society.

> [Science] aims to free an experience from all which is purely personal and strictly immediate; it aims to detach whatever it has in common with the subject matter of other experiences, and which, being common, may be saved for further use. It is, thus, an indispensible factor in social progress. (p. 226)

Over and over, he urged an integration of subject matter, of one subject with another, of all with the common experiences of life.

> Education should aim not at keeping science as a study of nature apart from literature as a record of human interests, but at cross-fertilizing both the natural sciences and the various human disciplines such as history, literature, economics, and politics. Pedagogically, the problem is simpler than the attempt to teach the sciences as mere technical bodies of information and technical forms of physical manipulation, on one side; and to teach humanistic studies as isolated subjects, on the other. For the latter procedure institutes an artificial separation in the pupils' experience. (p. 286)

Summary. The educator, on all levels, must devise an educational environment appropriate for directing the students' natural activities towards actions furthering the progressive growth of the society, as well as his own personal development. External control is fruitless; all direction must be within the framework of the learner's own experience, built upon his native tendencies. The most effective educational systems are those organized as social groups, utilizing mutual interactions to instill a sense of social responsibility. All subject matter should be taught in its social context, but the value of content must not be minimized, since knowledge in many areas is necessary for the understanding and improvement of society. The growth of the power to inquire is a means to this end, as well as to the goal of personal growth.

Subject matter should be generally integrated, since it is so experienced in actual life.

The College of the Model then conducts education, not apart from society, but as vitally integrated with society.

Characteristics of the College. Four characteristics have been defined.

Scientific teaching methods. There are extensive implications deriving from Dewey's theory of inquiry, when applied to education. Since inquiry arises from a problem, a dilemma which demands solution, it is largely an individual action. It is based upon the subject-matter of interest to or important to the inquirer. Therefore, it has meaning only as it relates to the particular experience of the individual; the dilemma can only be interpreted in his or her terms. Dewey eventually admitted that his attempt to use the word experience was not successful (Geiger, 1958/1974, p. 15). However, understood as he meant it, it is accurate. Piaget advanced a similar conception when he said that new cognitive structures are built upon the old (Piaget, 1932/1963). Dewey once said that nothing can come from nothing (1902a/1974, p. 18). James, who greatly influenced Dewey, had earlier written:

> It is obvious that the things which a given experience will suggest to a man depend on . . . his entire psychostatical conditions, his nature and stock of ideas, or in other words, his character, habits, memory, education, previous experience, and momentary mood. (James, 1890/1950, p. 107)

It follows that since inquiry must be based upon the experience of the individual, the individual acquires a new importance in education. All subject matter, to be useful, must be related to the experience of the individual.

The theory of inquiry implies action on the part of the

learner. This brings into question the effectiveness of rote learning and "endless recitation." It suggests, instead, education as an activity of the student, focused in a process of inquiry. The relationship between teacher and student has to be redefined. (See the section "Freedom and education" above.) Guidance, not the imposition of external control, becomes the responsibility of the teacher. Education becomes transactional--a mutual interchange between pupil, instructor, and other students.

Dewey expected that the findings of science in the area of learning and how it takes place would be incorporated into the College. His Experimental School was essentially designed to do exactly that.

> Like any . . . laboratory it had two main purposes: (1) to exhibit, test, verify, and criticize theoretical statements and principles, and (2) to add to the sum of facts and principles in its special line. In consequence, it was often called the Laboratory School. (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936, p. 3)

The authors called the Dewey School one of the earliest experiments in progressive education. The College of the Model makes full use of modern scientific knowledge in the realm of education.

Dewey's process of inquiry proceeds from problem to hypothesis, then action followed by conclusion--an indeterminant situation become determinant. But for education, the usefulness of a particular inquiry depends as well upon the readiness with which the solution generates new inquiry, in a spiraling process. In order to obtain a progressive deepening of understanding, a sequence of one inquiry built upon another, Dewey called for a "progressive organization of subject-matter" (1938a/1971, Chapter 7). The Model interprets this concept in two ways--as a suggestion for structure in curriculum and as an indication

of the need for specialization.

The question of structure. The question of structure in curriculum arises at least in part as a by-product of the emphasis upon the use of scientific method in Dewey's educational philosophy. Inquiry, he stated, begins with a problematic situation, a dilemma, a need felt by the learner. This perplexity is followed by suggestions and hypotheses which grow out of the individual's past experience. Therefore, it may be inferred that learning must begin with a need related to the particular student, and that the imposition of subject matter beyond the learner's experience is useless. Dewey did indeed refer to these inferences when he said: "There is an intimate and necessary relation between the processes of actual experience and education" (1938a/1971, p. 20). He continued:

> The problem for progressive education is: What is the place and meaning of subject-matter and of organization within experience? . . . When external authorities are rejected, it does not follow that all authority should be rejected, but rather that there is a need to search for a more effective source of authority. (pp. 20-21)

In a later chapter, Dewey sought to develop an answer to the question he proposed. In rather typical style, he first described some mistaken practices (which were often the sources of criticisms of progressive education). To build on the experience of the student, he said, does not mean merely to provide new experience. Rather, the new must be related intellectually to past experience. In addition, the new must look to the future. The skillful choice is one which will develop a new set of problems, inspire new inquiry. "Connectedness in growth must be [the] constant watchword" (p. 75). The educator's

responsibility is a dual one--he must see that inquiry arises from the experience of the present, within the abilities (or past experiences) of the student; and ensure that it leads to new inquiry.

A further criticism was launched.

> Improvisation that takes advantage of special occasions prevents teaching and learning from being stereotyped and dead. But the basic material of study cannot be picked up in a cursory manner. Occasions which are not and cannot be foreseen are bound to arise wherever there is intellectual freedom. They should be utilized. But there is a decided difference between using them in the development of a continuing line of activity and trusting to them to provide the chief material of learning. (pp. 78-79)

Dewey stressed, then, the necessity for a continuity of experience. He considered that the weakest point in the progressive schools at that time was this matter of the selection and organization of subject-matter, an issue which he called fundamental (p. 78).

Indeed, the extent of Dewey's emphasis upon this point is even more visible in Democracy and Education. Here he declared that "the first office of the social organ that we call the school" was to select fundamental features appropriate to the students and to establish a "progressive order," building from the simple to the more complex (1916a/1966, p. 20).

> Activity must be centered at a given time in such a way as to prepare for what comes next. The problem of the immediate response is complicated by one's having to be on the lookout for future occurrences. (p. 25)

But activity in the school implies direction by the school, by the educator who, from his broad base of experience, foresees some end toward which orderly activity progresses; proposes means appropriate to the particular institution or student; suggests a logical sequence as well

as possible alternatives (p. 102). Still, the essence of direction lies in the focusing of action toward a common result and a common understanding (p. 39), the socializing of the student discussed above.

Such comments seem indeed to offer little support for an abandonment of curriculum planning or the avoidance of the formation of general outlines of subject-matter in the fear of abridging a student's freedom or violating his individuality.

> Freedom does not consist in keeping up an uninterrupted and unimpeded external activity, but is something achieved through conquering, by personal reflection, the difficulties that prevent . . . spontaneous success. (Dewey, 1910/1933, p. 88)

> Some organization of subject-matter reached through a serial or consecutive course of doings, held together within the unity of progressively growing occupation or project, is the only means which corresponds to real individuality. So far is organization from being hostile to the principle of individuality. (Dewey, 1928/1959, p. 121)

In perhaps his most critical comment on progressive education, Dewey clearly stated his position.

> In some progressive schools the fear of adult imposition has become a veritable phobia. . . . Many of the current interpretations of the child-centered school, of pupil initiative and pupil-purposing and planning, suffer from exactly the same fallacy as the adult-imposition method of the traditional school--only in inverted form. That is, they are still obsessed by the personal factor; they conceive of no alternative to adult dictation save child dictation.
>
> . . . Guidance and direction mean that the impulses and desires [of the child] take effect through material that is impersonal and objective. And this subject matter can be provided in a way which will obtain ordered and consecutive development of experience only by means of the thoughtful selection and organization of material by those having the broadest experience. (1930, p. 205)

How, then should Dewey's philosophy be interpreted at the college level? Should there be required courses, required patterns of

subject-matter, or some other mechanism for organizing the educational experience in order to provide continuity and a progressive development of inquiry? An examination of the practical applications that Dewey utilized in his own experimental school, the Laboratory School at Chicago, provides some insight (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936).

Dewey varied the educational applications of his theory as the child matured. He proposed stages of development for the elementary years, based upon five years of observation in the Laboratory School. The first stage was from four to eight years. At this age the child's interests in social and personal matters demand an immediate response, which was usually expressed in physical action. The subject matter that was selected as appropriate was a study of the occupations, thereby incorporating active involvement in familiar areas in social settings close to his own environment. Materials were presented as agencies to be used, not as information to be learned.

The second period, eight to eleven, was marked by a change in the child's responses from immediate concrete action in response to a situation, to a tendency to perceive an end-in-view, to postpone spontaneous activity, to the beginning of the development of skills which had a bearing upon the desired outcomes. Now the teacher faced the task of designing subject-matter which would lead the student into investigative behavior, utilizing scientific method--moving in some degree from applied science to pure science.

Dewey chose as an example the study of American history, (selected by the faculty as subject matter):

> [It furnished] a typical example of patience, courage, ingenuity, and continual judgement in adapting means to ends. . . . Since the aim is not "covering the ground" but the knowledge of social processes used to secure social results, no attempt is made to cover the entire history . . . of America. . . . The aim is to present a variety of climatic and local conditions, to show the different sorts of obstacles and helps . . . a variety of historic conditions. (1900/1974, pp. 107-108)

The third period of elementary education was close to secondary education. The student had now gained aptitude in "the tools of thought, inquiry and activity" appropriate to his experience, and had the ability to specialize in "distinctive studies and areas for technical and intellectual aims" (p. 115). Emphasis at this stage was placed on history, a review of the early colonial period, with much individual work expected. Photography served as a particular basis for scientific inquiry. It was decided that it would be "wise" for them to spend some time on current events, and so they did. An established aim for this age group was an increasing use of language; this was effected within the more direct activities in the study of history and other subjects. Algebra was taught directly, but a tool subject such as number work was integrated into practical activities, as were reading and composition (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936, pp. 220-236).

Unfortunately for many subsequent generations of educators, the Laboratory School did not survive long enough to give much reliable data on the child beyond thirteen, or on secondary school education. However, Dewey did define secondary education as the time when the skills the child has acquired are applied in "problems of investigation and reflection, leading on to recognition of the significance and necessity of generalization" (1936, p. 54).

It becomes evident, upon a careful reading of The Dewey School, that this working model of Dewey's educational philosophy represented a highly structured, albeit untraditional, organization. It is apparent that the selection of subject-matter was done by the staff. The broad outline was contingent, not upon expressed interests of the individual, but upon the educational aim held for the entire group. For example, the work of Group IV, aged seven, was based upon the experimental classification of this group (using data collected in prior years) as one in a transitional stage. The year's study, then, was designed to make use of the child's developing spirit of inquiry by encouraging a growing understanding of the "moving stream of life--whence and how it comes, whither and how it goes" (p. 97). The subject-matter to accomplish the general goal was to be history, and was to focus upon primitive times. The teacher had well-developed particular goals as well, such as an understanding of the origins and uses of tools, of fire, and of shelter; the improvement of life by social cooperation; and the value of experimental activities.

Again, in Group VIII, age eleven, all students studied the European backgrounds of the nations that colonized America, but in two groups, separated according to background. The subject-matter was modified in each section to suit the experience of the particular group, but not, it should be noted, of the individual child.

Flexibility in the curriculum appeared in the method of introduction of the pre-determined material, and it is here that the dedication to the interests of the child was apparent. However, control of the curriculum was always in the hands of the faculty. Mayhew and

Edwards reported:

> The children who had followed the regular work of the school had spent one year on social occupations, one on primitive life, one on explorations and discoveries, one on Chicago and the Virginia and Massachusetts Bay colonies. . . . The successful practices of each succeeding year became the revised program for the next year. Thus each year's work was the produc [sic] of repeated experiments and finally resulted in the general plan outlined above. (p. 322)

How far Dewey's practice was from that of educators who predicated the daily work of the school as a response to the immediate interest and impulses of the child can be dramatically seen in a section devoted to the "Adjustment of Program to Child's Age Level." Here is recorded Dewey's attention, not only to subject-matter, but to the proper balance between different areas of concentration. Actual time allotments were carefully made for various groups and specific studies. For example:

	Weekly	
Subject	Group III	Group IV & V
A. Cooking, Science	3½ hrs.	4-1/6 hrs.
Related Modes of Expression	3½ hrs.	
B. History, Literature	3½ hrs.	4-1/6 hrs.
Related Modes of Expression	3½ hrs.	
Shop		2-2/4 hrs.
Geography		1 hr.
Free Time		1 hr.

(Mayhew & Edwards, 1936, pp. 383-384)

The concept of the need for balance in education, shown here in its application in the Laboratory School, reoccurs in theoretical form in Democracy and Education (1916a/1966). It lends credence to the idea

that Dewey would expect a Deweyan College to require a balanced core of subject-matter be outlined in the course of studies. Recalling that he assigned to the school the task of educating the younger generation in a society too complex to be understood informally, one must grant that a wide range of knowledge about the society must be communicated. If the power to inquire is also conceded as a major goal, one must agree with Dewey that decisions must be made as to what subject-matter is to be subject to inquiry and for what purpose (p. 60). The answer for Dewey was to choose that subject-matter which would make the student effective in improving his/her society; to select areas of study which would educate in a "broad and flexible" manner (p. 67).

In summary, it is obvious that the responsibility for the choice of subject-matter, the sequence of presentation, the over-all design for providing a continuity of education was placed upon the faculty, not upon the child. The basis for the actual choices made was soundly rooted in educational philosophy and in line with current scientific knowledge of the child. The responsibility of the student was to shape and enrich the curriculum within limits by a genuine interaction with subject-matter and teacher, a transaction between school and pupil.

Bode once wrote:

> The lack of concern for the scientific organization of subject matter that is shown by the newer movements in education is an ominous fact. It tends to justify the suspicion that they seek to achieve the ends of education by a kind of magic.
>
> In terms of Dewey's conception of freedom it is not at all evident that there is no place for compulsion or prescription. (1938, p. 99)

From this vantage point of an understanding of Dewey's position on structure at the elementary level of education, it indeed seems feasible to adopt the position that the College should establish requirements as to courses and patterns of courses to be within the domain of Dewey's philosophy. Certainly, such prescription must be in line with the prerequisites that are firmly attached to Dewey's educational thinking. There must first be a sound philosophy which serves to clarify specific goals. Dewey did, as has been shown earlier in this chapter, establish his goal for education as a continuing and deepening development of the scientific method of inquiry within a social context.[11] Higher education must proceed on the same pathway, modifying the choice of subject-matter to fit the experience of the older student, without doing violence to those principles involved in the general philosophy. Although necessary, the need for scholarship, for technical information for example, must not overwhelm the call for wisdom.

> A false opposition is often set up also, especially in higher education, between information and understanding. . . . The real desideratum is getting command of scholarship--or skill--under conditions that at the same time exercise thought. The distinction between information and wisdom is old, and yet requires constantly to be redrawn. (1910/1933, p. 63)

Here again is the emphasis upon balance. Dewey has suggested that the college should join together the "culture factor (by which is meant the acquaintance with the best that has been thought and said and done in the past) and the practical factor--or, more truly speaking, the social factor . . . " (Dewey, 1902b/1969, p. 84). He also

---

[11] See Baker, (1955/1956), pp. 44-45.

suggested rather diffidently that probably the first two years of college should deal with general learning and culture, to acquaint the student with "both himself and the universe" (p. 101). The last two years should provide the professional training or specialization, for "securing control of those specialized systems of knowledge and methods of research which fit the individual for the pursuit of his own calling in life."

> All of us have callings, occupations--only the luxuriously idle and the submerged idle, only the leisure class of fashion and of pauperism violate this law. When higher education ceases to ignore the universality and significance . . . of this fact of occupations, when it . . . adapts its curriculum and methods to it, the college will be coherent in itself and in relation to the social whole." (p. 104)

It may be concluded then that the Deweyan College provides a structured curriculum which includes a core and sequence of studies designed to secure continuity and a balanced education, a core of knowledge essential to profitable inquiry, to the wise participation in the affairs of the society. Any focus may be chosen, traditional or otherwise, but the essential concepts are retained. All routes lead to the common end.

Specialization. It is now that one can see an argument for yet another new proposition--that Dewey would expect the College to lay out some system for assuring that each student pursue some area of interest in depth, most usually vocational. This closes a circle that Dewey has inscribed--from a study of occupations in the very early years as a tool for establishing habits and skills in inquiry, to the preparation for an occupation of one's own. Although many progressives, and Kilpatrick in particular, often stressed that education is life, not

preparation for life, it is clear from the selection quoted above that a college must, in Dewey's eyes, consider the vocational goals of its students. Perhaps he would explain that the interest of the individual in a specific area as an expected part of his future has made this concern already a part of his present, and thereby a legitimate focus for current studies. That the faculty should exercise some control over the proper preparation for a chemist, for example, seems a logical conclusion, since they may indeed be considered to have "the broadest experience" to which Dewey referred. (See page 68.)

A second basis for the proposition rests again on the nature of the theory of inquiry. The process of inquiry follows a spiral path. From first to last, one inquiry builds upon another. Progressive development of inquiry implies a vertical continuum, rather than many lateral or parallel ventures. As pointed out earlier, Dewey saw even the thirteen year old as ready for a certain amount of specialization. To allow the still more mature college student to dissipate his or her intellectual abilities in four years of unfocused study is antithetical to the broad implications of Dewey's philosophy.

In conclusion, it is proposed that the College, founded on Dewey's philosophy, requires each student to explore some area in depth.

The experimental college. Thorston Veblen, a colleague of Dewey's at Columbia, at one time charged that educational changes had characteristically been initiated "blindly, by impulse, without much foreknowledge of any ulterior consequences" (Veblen, 1918, p. 13). Dewey envisioned a happier situation in education--a dedication by educators to a science of education, a "time when blind experimentation is

to give way to something more directed" (1902b/1969, p. 48). In an address on the occasion of his acceptance of the honorary presidency of the Progressive Education Association, he asked the progressive educators of the day several provocative questions that were in the way of being veiled criticisms:

> Is experimentation a process of trying anything at least once, of putting into immediate effect any "happy thought" that comes to mind, or does it rest upon principles which are adopted at least as a working hypothesis? Are actual results consistently observed and used to check an underlying hypothesis? (1928/1959, p. 114)

Some years later, Dewey published a small book called The Sources of a Science of Education. Within those few pages, he outlined the basis for a scientific improvement of the process of educating, calling upon his theory of values, pointing again to the necessary use of inquiry, and insisting that all education is experimental--"an endless . . . spiral."

The question that Dewey addresses is the manner in which a science of education might be achieved.

> What are the ways by means of which the function of education can be conducted with systematic increase of intelligent control and understanding? What are the materials upon which we may . . . draw in order that educational activities may become in a less degree products of routine, tradition? (1929b, p. 9)

The answer begins, he replied, in the "minds of those engaged in directing educational activities." Only the inquiring mind of responsible educators, versed in the skills of reflective thinking, can create a science out of educating. He further implicates the concept of inquiry by establishing a familiar sequence (pp. 33-34).

(1) Educational practices (in the classroom) provide the

problems of inquiry in education. They alone are the legitimate sources for the subject matter of educational research.

(2) They alone are the "tests of value"; the means for the evaluation of the results of research. This point is crucial in that it gives to the scientific or statistical data emanating from educational research only an "auxiliary" role, not the authority to serve as a mandate for "rules of action."

These two points directly relate to Dewey's theory of values, to his insistence upon the continuity between ends and means. Again, he reiterated that "ends must be framed in light of available means."

> When means and ends are viewed as if they were separate, . . . ends, values become empty, verbal. . . . Means are taken to signify means already at hand. . . . accepted because they are already in common use. (p. 59)

Almost ten years later, Dewey still found it necessary to rephrase this concept:

> But without the knowledge of actual conditions and of relations of cause and effect, any values that are set up as ends are bare ideals in the sense in which "ideal" means utopian, without means for its realization. (1938c, p. 472)

The conclusion drawn was that educational science is a process. It is based upon the actual life in the classroom, upon reflective thought directed towards the problems that arise in the school, upon a scientific use of data that accumulate, upon a constant reevaluation of means and ends.

> [Education] is an activity which includes science within itself. In the very process it sets more problems to be further studied, which then react into the educative process to change it still further, and thus demand more thought, more science, and so on, in everlasting sequence. (1929b, p. 77)

The idea that education should be anywhere carried on without a constant concern with the flux between present and future, between results and ambitions, between ideals and practices, was summarily rejected by Dewey. Activity--all activity--was conceived to be, in its most human form, experimental in nature. In education, it should rightfully be consciously so. Eternal vigilance was urged.

> It should be a commonplace . . . that no education . . . is progressive unless it is making progress. Nothing is more reactionary . . . than the effort to live according to the ideas, principles, customs, habits or institutions which at some time in the past represented a change for the better. . . . Blind attachment to what was good for a state of affairs that no longer exists prevents recognition of the needs of the present and blots out of view the desirable ends that those needs should generate. As Emerson puts it, the attained good tends to become the enemy of the better. (1928/1959, p. 131)

It is proposed that a college which intends to implement Dewey's principles must be organized as an experiment in education.

In summary, it has been established that a Deweyan college should be dedicated to Dewey's two main goals, and would have certain distinct characteristics. The Model incorporates these features.

The Model

Aims of the College

(1) The College holds as a major goal for each student the development of the power to think reflectively, to inquire using the methods of science.

(a) The College requires the study of science (properly taught in its social context) as a suitable vehicle for learning to inquire and as a vital source of the

essential knowledge for the understanding of the society in which he lives.

(b) The College in addition presents other subject matter in a manner calculated to promote reflective thinking.

(2) The College presents education as a growth of the individual directed toward social aims; it prepares its students to improve the society as well as themselves. Education at the College is conducted as an integral part of society, not as a separate entity. All subject matter is taught in in its social context.

Characteristics of the College

(1) Scientific teaching methods are the techniques of choice. Attention is given to the individuality, interest, and experience of the student. Education at the College requires activity by both learner and teacher in a transactional manner. New developments in the science of education are considered.

(2) Structure at the College is that needed to bring about the desired outcome within its particular setting. Curriculum design is the responsibility of the faculty and administration; flexible enough to adapt to the individual, but structured enough to define and require suitable means to the ends espoused by the College. A balanced core of studies is required.

(3) A student at the College is required to explore some area

in depth.

(4) The College is planned and conducted as an experiment in education.

Reference Notes

1. Thelen, L. Perceptions of science. Unpublished paper. Undated.

Reference List

Archambault, R. (Ed.). John Dewey on education: Selected writings. New York: Random House, 1964.

Baker, M. Foundations of John Dewey's educational theory. New York: Atherton Press, 1955/1966.

Bode, B. Progressive education at the crossroads. New York: Newson, 1938.

Bronowski, J. Common sense. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Butts, F. The college charts its course. New York: McGraw Hill, 1939.

Brubacher, J., & Rudy, W. Higher education in transition: An American history. 1631-1955 (3'rd Ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1976. (Originally published, 1958.)

Childs, J. The educational philosophy of John Dewey. In P. Schilpp (Ed.), The philosophy of John Dewey (Vol. I). Chicago: Northwestern University, 1939.

Dewey, J. The study of ethics: A syllabus. Ann Arbor: Register Publishing, 1894. Quoted in Schneider, H., Dewey's ethics: Part one. In J. Boydston (Ed.), Guide to the works of John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern University Press, 1970.

Dewey, J. The school and society. In The child and the curriculum. The school and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. (Originally published, 1900.)

Dewey, J. The child and the curriculum. In The child and the curriculum. The school and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. (Originally published, 1902.) (a)

Dewey, J. The educational situation. New York: Arno Press, 1969. (Originally published, 1902.) (b)

Dewey, J. How we think (Rev. Ed.). Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933. (Originally published, 1910.)

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Free Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1916.) (a)

Dewey, J. The logic of judgements of practise. Journal of Philosophy, 1916, 12(19), 505-523.

Dewey, J. What is freedom? In R. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education. New York: Random House, 1964. (Reprinted from Human nature and conduct. New York: Holt, 1922.)

Dewey, J. Science, belief and the public. New Republic, April 2, 1924, pp. 143-145.

Dewey, J. Progressive education and the science of education. Reprinted in M. Dworkin (Ed.). Dewey on education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959. (Originally published, 1928.)

Dewey, J. Individuality and experience. In Dewey, J., Barnes, A., Buermeyer, L., Munroe, T., Guillaume, P., Mullen, M., & de Mazia, V. Art and education. Merion, Pa.: Barnes Foundation Press, 1929. (a)

Dewey, J. Sources of a science of education. New York: Liveright Publishing, 1929. (b)

Dewey, J. The quest for certainty. New York: Paragon, 1979. (Originally published, 1929.) (c)

Dewey, J. How much freedom in new schools? New Republic, July 9, 1930, pp. 204-206.

Dewey, J. Science and society. Lehigh Alumni Bulletin, July 1931, pp. 6-7.

Dewey, J. The way out of educational confusion. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970. (Originally published, 1931.) (b)

Dewey, J. The supreme intellectual obligation. Science Education, February 1934, pp. 1-4.

Dewey, J. Introduction. In Mayhew, K., & Edwards, A., The Dewey School. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936.

Dewey, J. Experience and education. New York: Macmillan, 1971. (Originally published, 1938.) (a)

Dewey, J. Logic--The theory of inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1960. (Originally published, 1938.) (b)

Dewey, J. The relation of science and philosophy, as the basis of education. School and Society, 1938, 47, 470-473. (c)

Dewey, J. Experience, knowledge and values. In P. Schilpp (Ed.), The philosophy of John Dewey. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1939.

Dewey, J. Challenge to liberal thought. Fortune, April 1944, pp. 155-157; 180.

Dewey, J. Problems of men. New York: Philosophical Library, 1946.

Educational Policies Commission. Education and the spirit of science. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1966.

Geiger, G. John Dewey in perspective. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974. (Originally published, 1958.)

Hofstadter, R. The age of reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. New York: Vantage, 1955.

Hutchins, R. The higher learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

James, W. The principles of psychology (Vol. II). New York: Dover, 1950. (Originally published, 1890.)

Krutch, J. The modern temper. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1956. (Originally published, 1929.)

Levit, M. The context of a contextualist philosophy. The School Review, 1959, 66(2), 246-257.

Mayhew, K., & Edwards, A. The Dewey school. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936.

Piaget, J. The origins of intelligence in the child. (M. Cook, Trans.). New York: Norton, 1963. (Originally published, 1932.)

Popper, K. Conjectures and refutations. London: Routledge & Keegan, 1963.

Rucker, D. Dewey's ethics, Part two. In J. Boydston (Ed.), Guide to the works of John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Schwab, J. (Supervisor). Biology teacher's handbook. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963.

Veblen, T. The higher learning in America. New York: Huebach, 1918.

Wiebe, R. The search for order. 1877-1920. New York: Hill & Wang, 1967.

CHAPTER IV

BENNINGTON COLLEGE

The choice of Bennington College as the first of the sample to be examined was made because of its leadership role in experimentation in higher education in the twenties and thirties. Although Sarah Lawrence actually opened in 1928, some four years before Bennington, the Bennington plan was well developed by the time the idea of Sarah Lawrence was first activated.[1] A second reason for the selection of Bennington was the abundance of data available, data rich in discussions of educational philosophy and practice. Bennington was largely shaped by two extremely eloquent men--Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick, the evangelical "Million Dollar Professor" from Teachers College, and Bennington's first President, Dr. Robert Leigh. Much of the description of the process of the development of the "Bennington Idea" found its

---

[1]There seems to be some grounds for suggesting that the initial design for Sarah Lawrence was based in large part upon the early proposals of the Bennington plan. Miss Marion Coates, the first President of Sarah Lawrence, is reported to have remarked that she "had changed her curriculum to fit the educational discussion [on the Bennington idea] at the Colony Club on April 28, 1924" (McCullough, 1957, p. 23). Even before the time of that meeting, William Lawrence had approached Dr. Ravi-Booth, one of the originators of the idea of a woman's college in Bennington, with an offer of one million dollars, his Bronxville home and grounds, and the position as president of a college in memory of his wife. The educational philosophy being promoted, he declared, "made my ideals come to life" (p. 21). Indeed, at a later conference at Bennington in 1930, Mrs. Helen Lynd, author of Middletown and a faculty member at Sarah Lawrence, clearly stated that at that time, Sarah Lawrence "is doing what Bennington is trying to do" ("Proceedings," Note 1, p. 36). In a personal interview with Dr. Thomas

way into print and has been preserved.[2]

It should not be assumed that the ideas for Bennington were new conceptions. Prior to and during the long period of policy development at Bennington, a variety of experiments were underway at several institutions. Reed College, founded in 1911 to serve the city of Portland, Oregon, and the Northwest, was consciously dedicated to the reform of college education. Abandoning the usual admissions requirements, it sought to attract a student body with superior intellectual capacity and to establish on a college campus a respect for scholarly achievement. It frowned upon such staples of collegiate life as fraternities, intercollegiate athletics, and prescribed courses. Active participation in college government was expected. Its intitial emphasis was upon free election of courses. However, by 1939, this had been gradually replaced with a more balanced program wherein the first two years emphasized social and cultural themes, and the final years were devoted to specialization and the preparation of a Senior Thesis (Cottrell, 1939, pp. 197-198). Reed proclaimed that its "primary aim for the student should be to acquire the power to think for himself" (NSSE, 1932, pp. 139-140).

Other departures from the traditional were occupying Swarthmore

---

Brockway, early faculty member at Bennington, this idea was proposed. He agreed that there was no reason "why the president there shouldn't have . . . beaten Bennington to it--actually put it [the Bennington idea] into effect" (Brockway, Note 2).

[2]Unfortunately, one of the most promising sources is the diary of William Heard Kilpatrick, kept daily and meticulously over the years. It is not available until the year 1984, in accordance with the terms of his will (Brockway, Note 2).

College, which had introduced its Honors program as early as 1922 (Rudolph, 1962, pp. 456-457). At Rollins College, the German-University scientific approach had been rejected in favor of what Rudolph has characterized as "the concept of leisure, the tendency to aristocratic emphasis" (p. 458).[3,4] Hamilton Holt, President of Rollins, preferred however to describe the new concepts which he had introduced since 1925 as follows:

> At Rollins we hold the belief that the individual student's growth and development are the all-important things, and that to justify itself every course, by its subject matter and manner of being taught, must deepen and broaden the student's understanding of life and enable him to adjust himself more quickly and more effectively to the world in which he lives. (Holt, 1930, p. 372)

Holt's reforms included the banishment of both lecture and recitation systems, the minimization of examinations. The classroom became an echo of by-gone days when "Socrates gathered a few pupils around him and made the objective of his inquiry into this or that subject 'consistent thinking with a view to consistent action' " (p. 273).

In 1927, Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn established the Experimental College of the University of Wisconsin, a school "in which there are no

---

[3]Rudolph reported the founding date of Rollins in 1926. It actually opened in 1885 as a result of a strong initiative by the Congregational churches of Florida (assisted, incidently, by a Reverend W.W. Winchester of the Bennington Association of Vermont). In 1925, Hamilton Holt became President, and it was he who was credited with making Rollins "a milestone marking the road to future Progress . . ."; and for "the idea back of Rollins College . . . Progress and Personality" (Hanna, 1935, pp. 4-12).

[4]Rudolph also wrote: "Rollins symbolized, if it did not satisfy, all the sense of frustration, all the longing for recognition of human as opposed to scientific values, of liberal studies as the purpose of education, which in the 1920's were giving new emphasis to ancient purposes" (Rudolph, p. 458).

fixed classes and study times are elastic" ("The Experimental College," 1931, p. 268). And at Stephens College, President James M. Wood undertook to complete the transformation of a little, debt-ridden church school (originally the Columbia Female Academy) into an accredited junior college for women, "a significant experiment in American higher education" (Crighton, 1970, p. 183). During his first decade at Stephens, the years between 1912 and 1922, Wood designed an educational plan built around the "nature and distinctive role of women" (p. 202). Education at Stephens was to "enrich and develop the total personality, not the intellect alone" (p. 203). The emphasis was again upon the student, not the curriculum. Counseling was given a new prominence. "The aim was a balanced program, which would not only assist students to understand things of the mind and spirit, but would prepare them for taking their place in the world of business and the professions" (p. 204). This served as a working solution to the opposing demands of culture and technology discussed in Chapter III of this paper. Leyden has credited Stephens with providing significant impetus to the general education movement and to the development of the junior college (1964, p. 34).

One further example of educational innovations during Bennington's formative years was the introduction at Antioch around 1921 of the work-study plan, under the direction of President Arthur Morgan, an engineer of national renown. Its effectiveness was soon recognized. Some thirty years later, it was still producing scholars and

scientists in the Top Ten (Oldt, 1964, p. 17).[5]

These, and other educational experiments had their impact upon Bennington's founders. The reconstruction (which follows) of its early history with the focus upon the sequential development of the educational philosophy fulfills several important functions. Since many of the concepts fundamental to Bennington's system reappear in the other colleges in the sample, a detailed discussion of them at this point simplifies the later analyses. It is also possible, by examining the factors leading to the founding of Bennington, to establish to a modest degree a sense of the mood of the times, and to create an awareness of the excitement and expectations that the new college generated. In addition, the influences of Dewey and the progressive education movement on the nature of the Bennington experiment are clarified as the data are examined.

The Founding of Bennington

Dr. Ravi-Booth, pastor of the Congregational Church at Old Bennington, initiated the original idea. He has candidly described his first conviction that Old Bennington was in need of a new women's school:

> For considerably over a century Old Bennington was the center of the town. It was known as Bennington Center. . . . The town was then the center of the farming community. Then gradually came the great change from farming to industry. . . . Inevitably the community gravitated to where the business was being transacted, and Old Bennington was left high and dry. . . . All this

---

[5] See Kirkpatrick (1930) for a discussion of the progressive tendencies of President Morgan; also "A Road to Creativity" by Leuba (1971) for more on Morgan and Antioch.

> has profoundly affected the life of the First Church . . . As late as thirty years ago, at the head of each pew sat a man of character and influence . . . [with] . . . his entire family. . . . Such is no longer the case. . . . How can this old historic church, with its great traditions, be given a new lease of life? ("College Heads Favor Plans," Note 3)

Ravi-Booth approached community and educational leaders with his answer to his own question--the establishment of a fashionable boarding school for young ladies, which would, with its students, faculty, and staff, fill those empty pews. To his surprise, he found evidence of an urgent need for a new women's college in New England. The existing institutions were, from all accounts, turning away many eager candidates each year for lack of space.[6]

Following this revelation, Ravi-Booth initiated a flurry of meetings and conferences, recorded in detail by Mrs. Edith McCullough, first chairman of the Board of Trustees (1957).[7] In the end, Ravi-Booth lost his hoped-for congregation, but the town of Bennington gained a new "progressive" college which attracted national interest.[8]

The shift from exclusive finishing school to progressive college began soon after Dr. Ravi-Booth's first proposal. By August 1923,

---

[6]The Dean of Women at Middlebury College reported that it was usual to have from 180 to 240 applications for the 60 openings for women, under a quota set by the trustees. President Nielson of Smith confirmed the "frightful congestion" ("College Heads Favor Plans," Note 3). In 1924, President Comstock of Radcliff estimated that over 2,000 girls--qualified candidates--would be excluded from the next year's entering classes in women's colleges along ("Addresses at Colony Club," Note 4, p. 10).

[7]The history of the events leading to the founding of Bennington College has also been briefly reviewed by Benezet (1943/1971, pp. 74-76); and by Jones (1946, pp. xiv-xv).

[8]In 1972, Mrs. McCullough's son, John wrote this somewhat wry account of Booth's "motivation." "Ravi-Booth was something of a

a remarkable offer of a campus of 45 acres on the slopes of Mt. Anthony, with the eventual promise of the entire mountain, had been made by James Colgate, chairman of the Board of Trustees of Colgate (McCullough, 1957, p. 4). Ravi-Booth promptly gathered together interested parties for an organizational meeting on September 6, 1923. At this time, thirteen individuals signed an endorsement to support in Old Bennington "an institution of learning for women" (p. 70). (See Appendix A1.) This stirring occasion[9] was quickly followed by a second meeting of 75 of the elite of Bennington ("College Heads Favor Plans," Note 3). At this meeting, Dr. Nielson of Smith made the first recorded proposal for a "new" type of education--"Study the history of textiles, perhaps, and branch out from there" (McCullough, 1957, p. 14). Dr. Ravi-Booth closed the meeting by appointing a Committee of Twenty-One (all women), whose function was to continue the promotion of the college until a board of trustees and a president could be realized. Mrs. McCullough became the chairman of the Educational Committee. In that capacity she and her committee visited almost all the "standardized" eastern women's colleges. But it was at unconventional Antioch that President Morgan explained to them the work-study plan, the group

---

bizarre combination for those days, being half Scotch and half Italian . . . with a very eloquent mind which was connected in no particular order of intellectual consistency. . . . In the beginning, I think, the motivation for his wanting to start a college here was that Reverend Vincent Ravi-Booth did not find a very interesting congregation in Old Bennington and believed if he had a finishing school for girls here, it would be a source not only of more congregation, but certainly a more attractive one" (McCullough, 1972, p. 4).

[9]One lady said, "When I signed, I felt as though I signed for a new constellation in the heavens" (p. 14).

tutorial, and the concept of honors work. When, quite by accident, Mrs. McCullough became responsible for planning a New York meeting for over a hundred prominent citizens, in near panic she consulted a neighbor of hers, who was in fact Dr. Graves, New York State Commisioner of Education. He agreed that there was indeed a need for more women's colleges in the East, and expressed a strong interest in an experimental institution. Such a school would be, he felt, in tempo with the reforms in the schools of education, as well as in the preparatory schools. It would, he felt, not only provide for a more liberal education for women, but also "unshackle the preparatory schools as well" (p. 17). These became, in the years ahead, two of the main arguments for the establishment of Bennington.

This gentle drift towards the progressive mode became an inescapable tide when Dr. Graves introduced Mrs. McCullough to William Heard Kilpatrick of Teachers College, a man generally known as John Dewey's most eloquent disciple. As the Colony Club meeting of April 28, 1924 was planned, Dr. Kilpatrick agreed to deliver the keynote address "provided that it would be on progressive education" (p. 19). Together, he and Ravi-Booth developed the first plan for Bennington College. (See Appendix A2.) It clearly bears stronger traces of Kilpatrick's philosophy than of Booths'.

When Kilpatrick delivered his speech, "Why a New Plan?", at the Colony Club, he elaborated upon the joint plan. He also reminded his audience that women can indeed do as well as men; that both men and women need a new deal in education; that Bennington College would provide an excellent opportunity to put into effect the new philosophy of

education being worked out on lower levels. He predicated three planks for the plan: a cultural college of the first grade; an "honest and stubborn" effort to abandon the old in favor of a scientific effort to deal with problems; and an effort to leave the future control to the best thought of the future. (See Appendix A3 for what appears to be an outline for this speech.)

Kilpatrick presented an array of innovations for consideration. He began with new entrance requirements, designed to "free secondary education from the bondage to the colleges." He recommended the extension of the honors program to more students; a cessation of the practice of requiring courses; a serious study of both students and course content; a new concept of "education as life and not a mere preparation for life" ("Addresses," Note 4).

From this point on the reins seemed to have passed from Dr. Ravi-Booth to Dr. Kilpatrick who remained in control until the appointment of Leigh as first president.[10] At the conferences that followed

---

[10]Tennenbaum, in his biography of Dr. Kilpatrick, indicated that Kilpatrick and Leigh agreed that he (Kilpatrick) should not try to manage affairs or exercise control at Bennington. "I kept my hands off almost entirely: I had no special discussions with Dr. Leigh, except as any trustee might" (Tennenbaum, 1951, p. 214.) This may not have been a very accurate recollection. There is reason to infer that the relationship between Kilpatrick and the college was not always easy. Brockway said, "People have different views of him. One of our trustees . . . thought Kilpatrick was the most radical person he had ever known. . . . He said he was trying to taint our society, and probably he was. . . . Mr. Kilpatrick thought Mr. McCullough was the most conservative man that he had ever met" (Brockway, Note 2). At any rate, Kilpatrick was never reappointed to the Board. Brockway surmised that Kilpatrick probably was well enough pleased. However, Kilpatrick's diary bore this entry: "It comes as a kind of shock, but it is, of course, what I must henceforth expect . . . [after retirement]." Tennenbaum, 1951, p. 300)

in wake of the strong interest generated by the publicity attendant upon the Colony Club meeting (at which over a hundred people had to be turned away), it is apparent that Dr. Kilpatrick did, in effect, succeed in impressing his ideas upon the participants. As he chaired a conference of 17 educators on August 29-30, 1924, in spite of the lengthy discussions, there was little movement away from or disagreement with any of his personal concerns ("Conference of Educators," Note 5).[11] At the close of the conference, the educators agreed upon a set of eight objectives which are clearly stamped with Kilpatrick's philosophy. (See Appendix A4.)

Buoyed by the consecutive votes of confidence at the Colony Club and at the Educators' Conference, the committee applied for and obtained a charter (April 21, 1925). The committee of Twenty-One thereupon became the Board of Trustees, with some addition of eminent male educators and wealthy husbands. The long search for a president began. Finally, Dr. Robert Leigh, a former student of Kilpatrick, accepted the Presidency in January of 1928. He, it is worth noting, taught for a while at Reed College, whose experimental bias has been discussed earlier. Dr. Leigh immediately began a vigorous campaign of speech-making, money-raising, and publicity-garnering. In the autumn

---

[11] Dr. Robert Mattuck, a member of the Goddard faculty since its first year, had considerable contact with Dr. Kilpatrick, also one of Goddard's founders. Kilpatrick was, he said, "a scoundrel--a delightful scoundrel. . . . He was very impressive and an absolutely sweet man. But you'd have a discussion and Kilpatrick would fall on you. You'd say your piece . . . then in his Georgian accent, Kilpatrick would say 'Well, if I understand you rightly,' and then rephrase what you had said in such a way, you didn't recognize it. But, it got across what he wanted to get across. He was beautiful." (Mattuck, Note 6)

of 1928, Dr. Leigh made his "maiden" speech for Bennington College at the Progressive Education Association meeting in New York. In this talk, he commented on the wisdom of the trustees in leaving the faculty and President "free to formulate educational plans for the institution" (Leigh, 1928, p. 86). However, the major concepts which he presented were those developed under Kilpatrick--new admission policies, extension of the honors system, an intensive counseling system to determine the needs of the individual.[12] Leigh's role in the next four years was less that of innovative educator than competent fundraiser and administrator.[13]

The advent of the depression tested the enthusiasm of all involved. Dr. Colgate withdrew in 1930 his offer of a campus and a mountain. Most of the pledges procured by Dr. Ravi-Booth proved to be uncollectable under the stringencies of the changed economy. Fundraisers, once so indefatigable, defected; trustees resigned. In June of 1930, Dr. Leigh called yet another conference of educators--this time of thirty heads of progressive schools and college personnel active in modern education. The roster included Wilfred Aiken, then Director of the John Burroughs School; Helen Lynd of Sarah Lawrence; Helen Parkhurst, Principal of the Dalton Schools; and, of course, Dr. Kilpatrick.

---

[12]A standard letter written by Kilpatrick for mailing in response to inquiries contained these same points (Kilpatrick, 1926, pp. 71-78).

[13]In 1939, Leigh spent several months at Bard as temporary Dean, during a period of crisis at that college. His recommendations to the trustees were focused almost entirely upon financial alternatives and no major changes in program were suggested (Gray, 1940, pp. 3-4). Later speeches reviewed his years at Bennington essentially in terms of his financial stewardship.

(See Appendix A5 for a complete list of the participants and their affiliations.)

Dr. Leigh recalled the persistent tie between Bennington College and the progressive school movement. He urged the group to give him its best opinion as to the advisability of continuing his project in light of the manifest difficulties. The consensus of the gathering was affirmative--Bennington College was needed ("Proceedings," Note 1). Thereupon, Leigh renewed his efforts and revised his Educational Plan for Bennington College. In this document he detailed its philosophy in the form that guided the college for many years and proposed specific implementation (Leigh, Note 7). (See Appendix A6 for his list of 18 essential features.)

Despite intervening difficulties and delays, the first young women arrived on campus to enliven the New England style clapboard dormitories in the fall of 1932. The long struggles of those Bennington women and the small town pastor had created a campus of exceptional beauty, surrounded by Vermont's gentle blue mountains, with an architectural landscaping effectively designed to contribute to the sense of tranquility. Mrs. McCullough recalled that at the final meeting before the freshmen were to arrive, people remarked: "Here is the picture of a perfect campus. Why [must] the girls come and tousel it up?" (p. 46).

Dewey's influence. To facilitate an evaluation of philosophy and practices at Bennington, its relationship to Dewey must be clarified. The outline above of its founding history has firmly established its

conscious ties with the progressive school movement. However, as pointed out earlier, the assumption of a correlation between progressive and Deweyan philosophy may not be reliable, since progressivism has been quite variously defined. But at Bennington, there is ample evidence that Dewey's philosophy was indeed considered to be fundamental to its educational policy.

The prominence of Kilpatrick (who succeeded Mrs. McCullough as chairman of the Board of Trustees in 1932) lends credence to the idea that there was a strong Dewey influence, since Kilpatrick was, and still is, seen by most as Dewey's best advocate.[14] There are, however, numerous other references to the influence of Dewey upon the college. The Educational Plan was in fact sent to John Dewey (and many other educators) for his appraisal and received favorable if rather noncommittal comments ("Comments," Note 8).[15]

Dr. Leigh, in an interview in 1958, traced the influences which had shaped his own philosophy; his stay at Reed College, his work at Columbia on the experimental Contemporary Civilization courses that had

---

[14]Kilpatrick once wrote; "As to Dewey's comparative place in the history of philosophy, I place him next to Plato and Aristotle. As to his place in the history of education, he is, as I see it, the greatest the world has yet beheld" (Kilpatrick, 1959, p. 16).

[15]"I have read the statement of the educational plan of Bennington College with much interest. It appears certain that the increased interest and activity of the so-called Progressive Schools (and I should include under this heading a considerable part of the work done in the better public schools that are not technically known as Progressive) must sooner or later find a reflex in the curriculum and methods of college education. The Plan seems to me to be well thought out. Without undertaking anything radical now, it combines in itself a number of the best factors that are now scattered through different universities. I hope you will be successful in securing official support to carry your enterprise through."

drawn much attention, and the negative impressions that he received at Williams, where coverage of subject matter was much emphasized. "Dewey's idea's that one should employ the content which brought out the best student response made much more sense" (Hyatt, Note 9, pp. 44-45). Dr. Burkhardt (third President of Bennington) attributed Bennington's novel approach to higher education in part to the "educational theories of John Dewey, as elaborated in the progressive education movement" (Burkhardt, 1957, p. 21). Questioned as to what elements of the college he would retain if he were to rebuild Bennington from scratch, he included "the basic Dewey approach to teaching and learning--the development of the whole person,[16] learning by doing, the project method." When reminded of the then current criticisms of the Dewey approach, he firmly insisted that "the Dewey approach has completely proven itself" (Hyatt, Note 9, p. 34).

John Dewey was in fact the principal speaker at Bennington's opening ceremonies in September, 1932, and one of the student houses still bears his name ("College Institutes Series," Note 10, p. 1). Barbara Jones, first a faculty member, later wife of the second President, but best known as college historian of note, provides this insight:

> The demand for the appointment of a philosopher came first from Literature, in the second year of the College. . . . Immediately, the philosophical battle was joined: Social Studies insisted that anyone charged with the teaching of philosophy at Bennington should at least be familiar with and tolerant of the Deweyan point of view. [Footnote]

---

[16]The issue of the relationship of the "whole person" concept to Dewey's thought will be examined later.

> This was the philosophy to which the original educational plan owed most; but it has never been shared by all the members of the Bennington faculty." (Jones, 1946, p. 79)

Two early members of the faculty were recently asked their opinion about the extent of Dewey's influence on education at Bennington. Dr. Thomas Brockway, a historian currently involved in writing a new history of the college, a former acting president, and a faculty member since 1933, suggested that "there was some question about whether Dewey was in command at Bennington. His representative at Bennington was Dr. Kilpatrick, who probably disagreed on some points." He remarked that "we [the faculty] didn't know much about progressive education. We had had no contact with it" (Brockway, Note 2).[17]

When Dr. Robert Woodworth, faculty member since the first and backbone of the Science division, was asked the same question, he replied that, although he considered Dewey's influence to be strong, he did not recall that discussions of his philosophy ever came up in faculty meetings--"It was in the structure of the place." He felt that Bennington "was much more dedicated to Dewey and Kilpatrick than to progressivism" (Woodworth, Note 11).

Students have reflected upon Dewey's connection with their college. David Hyatt, in his paper "The Experiment at Bennington" (apparently highly enough regarded to be preserved in the archives),

---

[17] Since he did not arrive on campus until the second year, he missed the indoctrination period for faculty instigated by Leigh prior to the opening of the college (Brockway, 1972, p. 8). Catherine Osgood Foster recalled the first faculty meeting: "I remember the view, the sultry breeze, the warmth of the friendly greetings from the faculty, and the way President Leigh, standing with his back to the view, roused us with good lively talk about progressive education methods and their great results" (Foster, 1972, p. 11).

expressed his conviction that "Bennington's democratic, self-disciplined student life and its campus self-government exemplify . . . the very best that is embodied in Dewey's philosophy" (Hyatt, Note 9, p. 55). A student commentator on the college history once concluded:

> Bennington College began when the new theories of education, developed from the philosophies of John Dewey and others, were found to be of value in the progressive schools that existed during the first quarter of the century. . . . The need was for a college that would bring together . . . in one place . . . [these] . . . ideas." (C.L.M., Note 12)

In an external evaluation authorized by the college in 1961, the director of the study, George Soule, attributed the philosophy of the educational plan at Bennington in part to "the views of John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, and Edward Thorndike" (Soule, Note 13, p. 12). Official recognition of Dewey's place in the history of Bennington was given in the year of his death. The student paper reported the establishment by the faculty of an annual John Dewey Memorial lecture:

> At Bennington, we mourn his death not only because a great man has departed from the world, but because this man was one of the spiritual Founding Fathers of the College. More than any other man's, his ideas influenced the progressive educational plan on which Bennington was founded. ("College Institutes Series," Note 10)

Summary. Bennington College was, in many ways, a product of the times. For some years, the revolt against traditional educational practices had been building. New scientific discoveries about teaching and testing the child had armed educators with exciting new tools and inspired the more venturesome to attempt to convert the staid world of entrenched policy into a fresh universe where the individual was freed

from formalism, freed to develop his natural capacities. Experiment on many fronts occupied educators on all levels, but mostly outside of higher education. Bennington's uniqueness lay, not in creating new philosophical concepts, but in its attempt to build a completely new institution that would be free of all the evils of traditionalism, incorporating all that was promising in the "new" education. Thus Bennington, like its first president, was in a sense an administrator, an administrator of progressivism. It defined the details of progressivism's role in higher education and planned the implementation of its fundamental philosophy in an experiment that caught the attention of educators and layman alike.

The conclusion can be drawn with some certitude that many of those associated with Bennington's early days--administrators, faculty, and students, considered the college as a logical extension of the progressive movement and as an implementation of Dewey's thought. There is less assurance that there was any significant differentiation made between the two. The following sections will examine Bennington's particular brand of progressivism and measure it against the established model for a college built upon Deweyan philosophy.

The Educational Plan in Operation

Leigh's "Educational Plan" listed 18 essential features. (See Appendix A6.) In this document, he explained in detail the rationale behind each item (Note 7). Some close attention will be given here to these features, since many will re-occur in later discussions of other colleges. In addition, the practice of each will be evaluated,

generally in terms of the first ten years of operation. Those topics which have a particular bearing upon issues inherent in the Model will, of course, receive more attention. Because the 18 features have a somewhat amorphous structure, several have been combined under more general headings in an effort to secure better organization.

Admissions, tuition, and scholarships. Since one of the fundamental motivations for Bennington was to provide an outlet for graduates of progressive preparatory schools, the admissions policy was of prime importance. Because of the unconventional curricula in these secondary schools, it was inevitable that Bennington requirements for its candidates would be unique among colleges. Kilpatrick had expressed his views in the Colony Club Address; Dr. Leigh had the task of interpreting them in action.

He proposed that the successful candidate should probably (but not necessarily) have completed a secondary school course with some evidence of some specialized ability in one of the four main fields of education--literature, fine arts, natural and physical science, and social studies. Criteria for acceptance would be based on (a) quality of the school record, irrespective of the actual subjects studied (clearly a response to the progressive secondary school); (b) scores on tests such as the SAT; (c) general records such as evaluations and recommendations from those familiar with the candidate (Note 7, pp. 6-7).

In 1938, Leigh claimed success for this novel admissions policy. Bennington students were in fact a capable group, as good as at

any of the most respected colleges for women. On measures such as the National Council Scholastic Aptitude examination, the middle student at Bennington, Leigh declared, was consistently in the top 10-18 percent of all those taking the test (Note 13, p. 3). Eurich's study of the years from 1932-1940 provided corroborating data. On standard psychological tests, more than half of Bennington students covered the same range of scores as the top 25 percent of the general college population. On the SAT, the Bennington students' average score was 541, a score in the 60'th percentile (Eurich, Note 14, p. 8).

It is also clear that in the early years of the college, many progressive schools did indeed respond to the relaxed admission plan and send their graduates to Bennington. Eurich found that 21 percent of all students in that same sample had attended one of the 30 progressive schools that participated in the Eight Year Study done by the Progressive Education Association. In fact, in the first year, 1932, the figure was actually close to 44 percent, dwindling to about 13 percent by 1940 (p. 7). It must be assumed that progressive schools other than those in the Eight Year study were also represented, increasing the total percent.

A factor which always strongly influences admissions is the tuition rate. Bennington instituted another innovative approach when it required that each student pay for the entire cost of her education. This was estimated to amount to around $950 to $975 for the first year, exclusive of room and board (Leigh, Note 7, p. 8). This concept caused trustee Abraham Flexner some concern. He wrote:

> The tuition charge, if I understand the figure correctly, will be the highest in the United States. This institution is not so conceived as to appeal particularly to the well-to-do, especially in competition with Bryn Mawr and Vassar. I wonder whether . . . an adequate student body can be enrolled. (Flexner, Note 15)

As it turned out, this particular worry was unfounded. The first year, one candidate was selected from each 2.5 applicants; by 1938, the ratio was one to five (Leigh, Note 13, p. 3). A more realistic problem was to devise means to ensure that Bennington would not become a college essentially for the children of wealthy families. The original intent had been to provide a democratic educational system with a balanced economic and geographic distribution ("Educators' Conference," Note 5). (See Appendix A1, item 4.) Dr. Leigh had thought that scholarship aid would serve to prevent an unseemly homogeneity in the college population. However the depression made drastic inroads upon the scholarship endowment plan. The goal of $693,000 in endowment to finance the first ten years of the scholarship system became unrealistic. In the revised financial plan of 1930, the amount of $78,532 was budgeted from operating expenses to provide financial assistance for the first year ("Revised Plan," Note 16, pp. 2-3). In 1938, according to President Leigh, more than one third of the students received some amount of assistance--data offered as evidence that Bennington was <u>not</u> a rich girls' college (Note 13, p. 12).

This statement is open to challenge. Eurich (Note 14) provided data pertinent to this issue in his study of 199 students in 1940. A social scale test showed only one of this group from the workingmen's class, none in the lower middle-class, and again one in the average

middle-class--all the rest were in the highest socio-economic levels. These figures indicate that only about one percent of students were below the upper middle-class. Further analysis of the data places only 3.5 percent in the upper middle-class or below. This strongly suggests that the Bennington girls were truly privileged young women. This conclusion is reinforced by further data on parents. Fifty percent of the fathers of Bennington students (1932-1940) were executives, lawyers, bankers, brokers and such. Seventy percent were also college graduates, and 21 percent of the mothers as well (p. 6). Moreover, 71 percent of the girls in this sample graduated from a private school (p. 7). Yet in 1958, Dr. Leigh still referred to the Bennington girl as of the middle and upper-middle-class (Hyatt, Note 9, p. 45). He was much closer to the truth when he remarked: "The college was able to obtain a student body of excellent quality largely because it could skim an intellectual cream off those economic groups who could afford to pay the high tuition involved" (Leigh, 1936, p. 11).

Curriculum organization.

Academic work on campus--the first two years. One of Kilpatrick's early concerns was that the first two years not be heavily weighted with required courses (1957, p. 74). Dr. Brockway has recalled that Kilpatrick's idea was to defer decisions on curriculum until the students had arrived on campus. "You'd study them for a year and then decide what they ought to have." This "ridiculous" notion was ignored by Dr. Leigh, who had, prior to the opening of classes, established four main areas for study (Brockway, Note 2). However, when the

first students appeared, there was indeed no set schedule of courses for their perusal, although there were professors adept in all four fields ready to go to work. These individuals were, we are told, strictly forbidden to announce what they wished to teach, but must wait for a group of students to request instruction in an area of their choice. This "appalling doctrine," Dr. Brockway has pointed out, met with less than universal favor. "Lists of courses began to circulate clandestinely, then openly, and finally appeared in the catalogue under Dr. Leigh's successor" (1979, p. 11). Catherine Osgood Foster recalls that news of the formation of a new course was posted on a bulletin board or announced verbally in the dining rooms (1972, p. 11).[18]

Much less informal were the expectations for the entering student. The Educational Plan clearly outlined the first two years work in general terms. Every student would take four semester courses a year, one in each of the four main areas described above. These introductory courses were not to be in the nature of survey courses, which were considered to be taboo at Bennington. They were, rather, to be more related to orientation courses (as Kilpatrick had very early suggested) and were to serve as exploration. This was expected to assist the student in identifying the area in which she would eventually specialize. Moreover, these courses were to be integrated around cultural epochs. For example, all of the introductory courses for the first year were to relate to modern western civilization: "the culture resulting . . . from scientific discovery and industrial revolution"

---

[18] See Jones (1946, pp. 54-56).

("Bennington College," 1932, p. 8). This particular portion of the plan fell quickly upon hard times and was never effectively implemented (Benezet, 1971, pp. 83-88).

There was another interesting aspect to the plan--a feature which was purely "Kilpatrician," to use a word suggested by Dr. Brockway. Even in his earliest lectures and writings about Bennington, Kilpatrick had emphatically declared that certain subjects should be relegated to the status of "tool" courses. Although he had himself been a mathematics teacher, he had decided that there was no "soul growth" in the study of the subject (Brockway, Note 2). The Educational Plan incorporated this rather bizarre notion, and the first catalogue explained the concept:

> Special techniques or "tools" of thought, investigation, and expression will be learned as essential parts of the work of the introductory courses. . . . In no cases will these "tool" courses be required of all students, they will be prescribed only in relation to visible need and use. ("Bennington College," 1932, p. 8)

These courses were identified as mathematics, English writing and speech, French, German and other languages.[19]

Besides the four recommended courses each year, the equivalent of a fifth course was required. This was the Trial Major Conference, and its function was also to assist the young women in their choice of majors. It was not a formal course as such, but more of a contract by the student to devote 1/5 or more of her work time in the field of her tentative choice. Each of the general introductory courses had

---

[19]See Tennenbaum for more on Kilpatrick's treatment of Mathematics (pp. 104-107).

available this group conference for the members of that class who wished to make that area his major. Although the system was designed to be flexible, students quickly became embarrassed to request a change of Trial Majors and thereby destroyed the effectiveness of the arrangement. Later thought on the matter concluded that it too early fixed the student in a major and did not serve in any real sense as exploration, but led to an over-emphasis upon specialization (Jones, 1946, pp. 67-68). When Lewis Jones became president, the Trial Major was abolished, as well as the general introductory courses and new "Basic Studies" were substituted.

The last two years. The work of the Senior Division was, according to the Plan, to be Honors work. Having proven herself competent in some field, each girl, under the supervision of an instructor, was to undertake individual study and projects. To prevent too narrow a focus, majors were to be within a division, not a department. For example, one majored in science, not in chemistry (pp. 11-12). The Senior Project, well-known feature of Bennington, was not developed until the first class reached the Senior Division in 1934 (Jones, 1946, pp. 58-59). This element has survived and is still an integral part of Bennington's educational life. Required of all graduates, it is "an exercise in the capacity for organization and, if possible, creative presentation of material . . . not necessarily based on original research (Soule, Note 17, p. 51).

A fair share for the fine arts. Perhaps the most creative of Bennington's departures from the ways of traditional education was the assignment to the arts of the same status as that accorded to

literature, the sciences, and social studies. More than any other aspect of the plan, this can be attributed to Deweyan rather than progressive thought. There was little precedent for this proposal. President Burkhardt traced the inclusion of the arts directly to the educational theories of John Dewey, as a natural consequence of his concentration on the individual and the education of the "whole person" (Burkhardt, 1957, p. 21). In Art as Experience Dewey defined the aesthetic experience as one characterized by wholeness, coherence, harmony--rooted in natural experience, not separate from it. Dewey characterized the conception of man as "the being that uses art" as that which both distinguishes man from nature and relates him to nature. In this respect, science is "but a central art auxiliary to the generation and utilization of other arts" (p. 26). Indeed, Dewey describes the process of artistic creation in terms of reflective thinking and says, "The idea that the artist does not think as intently and penetratingly as a scientific inquirer is absurd. . . . The production of a work of genuine art probably demands more intelligence than does most of the so-called thinking that goes on among those who pride themselves on being 'intellectuals' " (1934, pp. 45-46).

In 1949, a college fund-raising publication made this statement (again related to the idea of the whole man):

> Bennington . . . has given a place to the arts because it regards cultivation of the aesthetic sensibilities as of great importance in the development of well-minded personalities. ("Bennington," Note 18)

Henry Brandt, who became a member of the music faculty in 1959, spoke in terms of the psychological value of the practice of art as

incorporated at Bennington.

> The value . . . is the psychic armor that human art can provide. Today's technological environment is full of everyday things that are absolutely deadly to the human organism. . . . So the active practice of the arts amounts to a practical form of psychic self-defense. I wouldn't be surprised to learn that it is a biological form of self-defense, too. ("Music," 1974, p. 36)

An interesting story is told of the origin of Bennington's renowned modern dance program. Mrs. Leigh, who apparently exerted considerable influence upon her husband,[20] had turned her attention to the athletic program, which was suffering from the lack of a gynmasium. Having met the then unknown Martha Graham and appreciated her art, Mrs. Leigh conceived the idea of making exercise classes into an art form--namely, using the techniques of modern dance (McCullough, 1972, p. 4). Her husband also credited her with insisting that he consider Martha Hill, a student of Martha Graham and for many years later Bennington's esteemed associate, for a position on the faculty. Thus it was that Mrs. Leigh was in a sense responsible for making Bennington the center of American modern dance life (Leigh, Note 19, p. 10).

Off-campus education. In educational circles, Bennington's establishment of the long winter recess was a startling variance from the norm. There were, however, good reasons for its initiation--Vermont's long, cold winters, and its isolation from metropolitan centers. Ideally, both defects were to be remedied by giving the students free time from Christmas to Washington's birthday; not as an extended vaca-

---

[20] John McCullough reported: "Once when Arthur Page was Chairman of the Board of Trustees, he turned to my father during one meeting of the Board and said 'I hate to feel that we do all this work and make all these decisions only to have them taken home to a higher authority' " (1972, p. 4).

tion, but as a vacation to be used as an integral part of their education. They were expected to travel, do non-resident field work in groups or individually, utilize laboratory or library facilities at more sophisticated institutions, or undertake work of some educational value. This system shortly became known as the Winter Field and Reading Period. Barbara Jones (pp. 205-212) deemed the experiment a general success and pointed out that one of its important effects was the gradual introduction of students into the responsibilities of adult life. Surely, for those girls from wealthy homes who spent the time at some unglamorous employment the Winter Term was indeed educative. Among the changes that Dr. Jones made when he assumed the helm of the college was the extension of this period to nine weeks. In this form it still exists under the name of the Non-Resident Term.

A further provision for off-campus education was the acceptance of a year at some other university or educational center, if it could be shown that it would supply needed facilities unavailable at Bennington. Study abroad under controlled conditions was also permitted.

Life in the classroom. A large share of a student's education at Bennington took place outside of formal classes. In fact, Kilpatrick had early criticized this aspect of the system, suggesting that students needed the stimulation of group work (Jones, 1946, p. 9). But each girl spent some time in small classes headed by a professor. The role of the instructor at Bennington, however, was defined differently from that at the traditional college. Leigh, for example, stressed that coverage of material was to be minimized in favor of a concentration on developing principles and methods of thinking (Hyatt, Note 9, p. 45).

He had also virtually issued an edict against the lecture method of teaching, as can be inferred from Brockway's comments about classroom teaching styles:

> The faculty was pretty free to teach as they saw fit. . . . Wallace Fowlie was a good example. He lectured rather formally . . . and he gave exams. . . . Leigh said to him, "I think that you are going to succeed at Bennington in spite of your method . . . your professorial method. It's not like ours, but I think that you'll succeed." (Brockway, Note 2)

The methods generally used, according to Barbara Jones, resembled the university seminar approach, more than the usual college lecture technique. Small groups met in an informal manner. Discussion and planning of the course work with the class, using the instructor's over-all plan as a general guide, were characteristic activities. The use of textbooks was discouraged; increased library and reference work were preferred. Classes were held much less frequently than was usual, leaving more of the actual work to the individual student. The emphasis was upon the student's learning, rather than upon the teacher's teaching (pp. 25-26).

Grades and routine examinations, it is true, were banished, but in their place, a different, but perhaps no less stressful, system of evaluation was instituted. The student found herself in a small, intimate group, facing a professor who knew her by name, who would at intervals report to her counselor on her performance in class or studio and on the quality of her papers. He, in turn, would coordinate all the various reports concerning her. At the end of the year, she would receive a letter of evaluation based on all these data. And on such evidence depended her much-desired promotion to the Senior Division.

Dr. Leigh quite rightly declared that such "examination and comment of instructors is examination, regularly given" (1938, p. 6).

Although attendance was not required, any absence from a class of six or so students was painfully apparent. The demands of the frequent group work put an added responsibility upon each participant. Obviosly, it must have been difficult to absent oneself in a neutral manner.

As at any college, life in the classroom was colored by the calibre of the professor. But at Bennington, students were encouraged to be active in the evaluation of their professors. A Student Educational Policies Committee regularly reported to the administration on the performance of each faculty member. In this fashion, the student shared responsibility for the quality of her own education.

A wide range and interesting variety of teaching styles were used by the Bennington faculty. Some illustrations of these will be given later in this paper.

Freedom within structure. Bennington has consistently been plagued with the public's misconceptions of its program. A legend circulated (at least at Yale) about the young woman ready to enter Bennington's first class. She, it was reported with some head-shaking, revealed her conception of her chosen college with the remark: "I want to go to Bennington, wear pants, and stay up all night" (Coulson, 1951). A trustee and alumna reminisced: "In the '40s, even to the most enlightened circles, a Bennington girl, capital B.G., was WOW, something. . . . You know, that's where they supposedly do 'dangerous,

crazy, way-out things' " (Frankenthaler, 1972, p. 37).

Leigh, more than five years after the college opened, disparaged the concept of Bennington as "a place of unregulated freedom that tends to be faddish, with girls wearing freakish clothes and doing sensational stunts" (1938, p. 11). Even as late as 1974, the writer of that year's catalogue felt constrained to point out that Bennington students are not free to do "anything they want and get academic credit for it" ("The Bennington Idea," 1974, p. 3).

But freedom was there, deliberately built into the Plan, much of it in accord with progressive principles. There was freedom to explore various fields--this being the function of the general Introductory Courses. The freedom of the individual to work at her own pace in accordance with her own interests was a compelling feature of the educational philosophy. Rather than prescribed requirements, there was to be an individual program, planned by the student herself in conference with her counselor. There was freedom to expand or follow a personal interest outside of organized classes. The work of the Senior Division was to provide "freedom from formality and daily routine" with its emphasis upon tutorials and individual study. Abolishment of grades and examinations was to liberate the student from artificial incentives for learning. And again, there was freedom from campus regulations imposed from above (discussed more fully below under the heading "Community").

But structure, albeit not in the traditional form, was also there. The Plan denied, for example, that the individually arranged program was akin to free election. Instead of uniform requirements, there was a careful analysis of the student's needs in respect to her

interests and abilities and in light of the demands of her anticipated major. Barbara Jones summarized the situation:

> The Bennington system is not a free elective system. Programs are carefully prescribed as a result of a combination of student initiative and faculty direction and the counselor always has the final authority. (p. 34) [Underlining added.]

Dr. Brockway was asked whether, in the absence of formal requirements, the counselor in effect imposed other requirements upon students. His reply indicated that the counselor was to suggest that a particular course or plan might be desirable, but that he could not press beyond a certain point. He gave, however, as an example, this information from a former student. She reported that her counselor "wouldn't let her take anything with Fergusson because he thought Fergusson's philosophy was wrong. . . . She said she always wanted to take courses with Fergusson, but he wouldn't let her.--So counselors really had a lot of authority, depending on how strong they were and how strong the student was" (Note 2).

In contrast, another alumna wrote: "As a counselee, I remember being guided by such clear directives as take all the Fergusson and Burke you can' " (Livaudais, 1973).

Presumably the conscientious counselor kept in mind the educational policies of the college and insured that his (or her) charge, in the first two years was occupied with both exploration and specialization. Within the range of these constraints and of the somewhat sparse offerings, the student then could make such combinations as suited her tastes. She must, however, defend her program to the satisfaction of the Student Personnel Committee (made up of students, faculty, and

President Leigh), which scrutinized the program of every student in the Junior Division.

Promotion to the Senior Division was not automatic, nor were there uniform requirements. The Plan stipulated only that there be a demonstration of a distinct ability in one of the four major fields. In order to graduate, the student had to show work up to the standards set by Bennington's faculty, work that was at least competitive with that done at the best women's colleges. In addition, the candidate for graduation was expected to evidence emotional as well as intellectual maturity (Leigh, 1935, pp. 664-665).

One must agree with the author of the statement that a paradox was evident at Bennington. Bennington students have greater freedom than most college students, but they also receive more guidance and supervision ("Bennington," Note 18).

Community concerns. The fabled freedom at Bennington College was in part a consequence of Leigh's early decision that his young women were to be treated as adults, capable of governing themselves. So it came about that those first entering Freshmen found themselves bound by only one predetermined rule--they must leave notice of their whereabouts if off campus after eleven or for the weekend. They were immediately aware that there was also a dearth of supervisors. There was no dean of women, nor any house mothers. The students were then, quickly faced

with tasks related to self-government.[21] Each dormitory had to elect a house chairman, who met with the Student Personnel Committee to begin the development of a governing process for the college community. The result was a system whose fulcrum was the Community Council, composed of faculty, students, and President Leigh, to which were given legislative, executive, and judicial functions. Some changes took place in this arrangement over the years. For example, those students who persistently violated the few rules the council established (a total of three in that first year) were dealt with initially by the Community Council itself. Later a sub-committee, the Central Committee, took over this task, and it is now known as the Judicial Committee.

The most respected committee established by the Council was the Student Educational Policies Committee, made up of trial majors from each division. As noted above, this committee evaluated faculty, giving to each member and to the President an evaluation at the end of every semester. It also met with faculty and trustees to take an active part in the formation of policies relevant to education at Bennington. According to the sources available, this committee operated in a serious and competent manner (Brockway, 1979, pp. 9-11).

The total design, from self-government in the dormitories to a wide range of power vested the Council and its sub-committees, was developed in accordance with Leigh's broad concept of an education that

---

[21] Brockway commented: "There can be little doubt that the community was in fact organized as he [Leigh] wished it to be, but he saved himself the onus of dictatorship and the cost of deans and house mothers by involving the entire community in decisions affecting life and learning on the campus (1979, p. 11).

was whole.

> I wanted to build a college community that was not separate from the curriculum. I wanted to design an academic community in which all of the campus activities furnished integrated and constant learning experience. (Hyatt, Note 9)

Most of this was an elaboration upon the Plan, whose only reference to community concerns was an integration of classroom life and campus life. On the whole, there was apparent a heavier emphasis upon the individual education on campus than upon its relationship to life off-campus. This idea is discussed more fully later.

Bennington College and the Model

At this point, the investigation of the features of the Plan and the practices derived from them has been completed. Little judgement has been passed upon them as to their Deweyan or progressive qualities, although earlier discussions have made it clear that the concepts were proposed as examples of progressive thinking. Evaluation of Bennington's practices by comparison with the Model follows. Wherever necessary, additional data which did not appear in the examination of the Plan was introduced. Each of the two aims and the four characteristics of the Model were reviewed in sequence.

In the investigation of the two aims, it became obvious that actual practices were more promising than published aims. Bennington did publish in its first catalogue a list of ten aims. These remained essentially unchanged throughout the Leigh era ("Bennington College," 1932, pp. 4-5). (See Appendix A7.) Examination of the literature also turned up a variety of stated aims. Below is a small sample:

From the Plan--1930. You will learn how to stand on your own feet and to work with skill and understanding and scholarship in your chosen field. (p. 6)

1936. Its aims . . . are directly related to the purposes of those carrying on significant change elsewhere . . . [to demonstrate] both the advantages and the difficulties in the generally emerging ideas with regard to curriculum, method, and guidance. (Leigh, 1936, p. 9)

1940. Bennington College believes its function to be to develop civilized and competent people. ("Bennington College Asks Help," Note 20)

1945. Our aim is . . . the fullest development of the individual. . . . But it is also an education in individual responsibility. . . . It might be said our aim is to socialize the individual. I prefer to use the word "civilize" instead. (Jones, 1945, p. 8)

1961. Our goal is and should be a liberal education. ("Report," Note 21)

In 1942, Eurich reported in his study that Bennington's educational assumptions were neither clearly formulated nor generally agreed upon by the faculty. Few of the objectives, he complained, were defined as to what they implied in terms of student behavior--certainly a cardinal sin from Dewey's standpoint of the continuity of means and ends (Note 14). Clearly, practices appeared to be more reliable than did theories.

Teaching reflective thinking/scientific method. Examination of the published aims (See Appendix A7) failed to reveal any deliberate concern with Dewey's idea that the purpose of modern education should be the development in the student of the power to think reflectively, to use the scientific method. The next logical question then became--was this goal somehow accomplished in the educational process? The Model

established science as the most likely vehicle; therefore an examination of the teaching of science at Bennington was undertaken.

Science at Bennington. If one could establish that science was required at Bennington, half of the problem would be solved. There would, of course, remain the task of determining if it was taught in a fashion which would accord with Dewey's thought (See page 57). But at Bennington, as has already been shown, there were no prescribed courses of any sort. The counselor had no official way to insist that a student become familiar with some area of science. He could only cajole or prevail by the power of his personality. And the statistics show that student participation in science was consistently low. Dr. Brockway estimated that only about one-tenth of the students in any year enrolled in science, not the one-fourth one would anticipate if the recommended sequence for the general introductory courses were being followed. The ballooning of interest in the arts had, by the end of the Leigh era, advanced to the stage where 45 percent of the students were majoring in one of the performing or visual arts, leaving 55 percent for the other three divisions. It was science, according to him, who "got the worst of it" (Note 2).

Dr. Woodworth was somewhat more optimistic. He recalled that, although science had never been required, almost every student did study science in some form (Note 11). Eurich's study of the years from 1932-1941 indicated that actually only 74 percent of all graduates had studied any science. The 26 percent who completely avoided science were mostly from the drama-dance, literature and music majors. The total amount of time spent by students in the science courses was also

low. Non-major work (meant to occupy about a half of a student's study time) showed the same neglect of science. Only 6 percent of non-major work involved science. The science field also attracted fewer majors--the percentage ranging consistently between 9 to 12 percent over the years studied.

Eurich concluded that, compared to other colleges generally, Bennington students received considerably less exposure to the sciences in their total program. In a companion report on the Junior Division, Cornehlsen wrote: "The question of the place of science, outside of its contribution to preprofessional training, has been raised repeatedly and as yet the Bennington faculty have not found a satisfactory answer" (Note 22). Even as late as 1961, a study of the operations of the college came to a similar conclusion. Again, 13 out of 147 students studied had no science at all. A total of 111 had had no more than a single year's work in either science or mathematics. The study concluded that "our greatest specific weakness lies in our students substantial neglect of the natural sciences" (Note 21).

Eurich reflected upon the roots of the problem. He suggested that perhaps science was just not of great interest to the young women of the day. In order to remedy the situation, he proposed that either the principles of freedom to follow individual interests needed modification or some way must be found to stimulate student interest in science.

Dewey's answer to Bennington's problem would, of course, have been to suggest that interests should be followed, but within a structured curriculum which would insist upon science as essential to

education for which reflective thinking and a proper understanding of the society were major goals.

Deweyan aspects of science at Bennington. Even if science itself was not given a high priority, there was some evidence that President Leigh was concerned that a knowledge of scientific method be a part of the Bennington education. The first catalogue described a general course--"Introduction to Modern Science."

> An introduction to the fundamental conceptions of the natural world. Effort will be made to have students gain an understanding of scientific method of thought and investigation. The content will include significant samples from physics, chemistry, biology and physiology--also some introduction to astronomy and geology. ("Bennington College," 1932, pp. 10-11). [Underlining added.]

This course, which Dr. Brockway called Dr. Leigh's ideal of an integrated introductory course, unfortunately "died of its own weight within two weeks" (Cornehlsen, Note 22). It was replaced with another integrated course whose goals were:

> Work of an introductory nature directed primarily to an understanding of fundamental biological concepts, using the human body as a focal point of interest. ("Announcement for Second Year," 1933, p. 17)

This led to the Human Biology course which Dr. Woodworth taught with enthusiasm for more than 30 years. It became the most popular science course, "perhaps less because Dr. Leigh thought every student should take it and more because Dr. Woodworth taught it." An integrated science workshop was also introduced for science trial majors, again meant to familiarize the student with experimental method and scientific thinking (Brockway, 1977, p. 22).

This proposed emphasis upon scientific method[22] and on integration of content in the offerings of the science division were two aspects that accord well with Dewey's thought.

There were many unusual things done in the Division which would surely have delighted Dewey, who taught science to children through cooking, who recommended the thinning of the walls between disciplines (see page 63). Courses were developed for specific purposes--Genetics for social studies students, Physics of Sound for music majors, Chemistry of Pigments for artists and Physics of Light and Color for stagecraft and photography students (Cornehlsen, Note 22). Dr. Woodworth recounted this experience:

> A couple of years ago, a dancer came in and said that she was interested in knowing something about what was going on inside her body when she was dancing. She wondered if I would give her a tutorial in human anatomy for dancers. I said, "Oh, sure." Well, in a couple of days she came in with a friend who was interested, too. It ended up that we had 20 dancers and we had a ball! We had a lot of fun because they had practial information. For instance, they knew that a lot of Martha Graham's dancers were disabled for life because of her techniques. These kids were interested in making sure that they didn't get into any such situation. (pp. 10-11)

Several of Dewey's tenets are here well illustrated--instruction based on student interest and genuine need, integration of traditional content areas (music and anatomy), and the transactional nature of education. Dr. Woodworth agreed that he learned from that (and many another) tutorial.

---

[22] Dr. Woodworth, in a discussion about the importance of scientific method, revealed an unusual technique that he sometimes used. "I've had my kids read Hayakawa and other texts in general semantics when they were working on problems, just to give an idea of what's behind it, how important it is to get yourself out of the picture if possible."

Dr. Woodworth gave other examples of the creativity of the students at Bennington, tied in with his research in time-lag photography. His interest was in filming time-studies of a flower blooming, the hatching of a fish egg, or some related biological event. A number of students had, he said, composed music for some of his films, in an unusual combination of music and science. Dancers had joined their art with his, choreographing dances on the basis of plant movements revealed in his films, probably a unique undertaking on a college campus in those days. He further pointed out that at Bennington cross-divisional majors were encouraged and it was not uncommon to have such variations as Art and Biology or Human Development, a major which combined biology, psychology, and other social sciences.

Another Deweyan feature that Dr. Woodworth stressed was the extensive use made of project work in the division, especially in the early years. Each science major was required to do, not only the Senior Project,[23] but also a Junior Division project designed to "get the kids to work on their own . . . They learned a lot; of course, I learned a lot." He regretted that project work outside of the Senior Project had now more or less disappeared.

Cornehlsen's comments on the results of a study of the Science Division would appear to be accurate. He spoke of

> the drama, the energy, and the ingenuity with which science work was introduced and organized at Bennington. . . . There can be little doubt that within the framework of the college philosophy, the Science Division attempted to develop a

---

[23]This was only one of several requirements for a science major. There were also specific research and writing requirements for graduates ("Science Major," 1936, p. 18).

> curriculum which did not rely upon textbook learning and traditional type experiment. Instead, the curriculum was based upon student interest and motivation out of which projects were developed which cut across all branches of science. (p. 454)

Under the long direction of Dr. Woodworth, the Science Division seems to have operated not only within the college philosophy, but with a close adherence to Dewey's thought. The conclusion can be drawn that if every student at Bennington had an education equivalent to that which the science majors experienced during those first years, it could be said that they had had a Deweyan education.

Additional expectations. For those students who avoided science completely or whose contact with the Science Division was minimal, any exposure to the practice of reflective thinking had to come from some other phase of their education. One might suppose that the general requirement for a Senior Project might have provided an exercise in scientific thought. However, as already noted (page 109), the projects were not necessarily organized research. Dr. Brockway pointed out also that many of the art majors even did not written work at all for their Project. Instead they sculpted, painted, composed or did choreography (Note 2). Since a large number of those with no science were in the arts, then neither of these two avenues (science or written Project) provided them with formal experience in reflective thinking. (See however Dewey's thought on the relationship of artistic creation and reflective thinking, page 110.) The only route left was their other course work. Had there been a general emphasis upon scientific method in all courses, then one might conclude that these students would have been properly instructed in this important segment of their education.

But the lack of a philosophical concern for this end and a dearth of reference to it found in the search of available data indicate that probably many of these students left Bennington without a clear conception of experimental method or of scientific thinking.

There was found one notable exception. Barbara Jones wrote:

> The Social Studies faculty agreed upon the scientific method as the unifying characteristic of the work of the division. . . . The Social studies Division therefore conceived its special role to be the training of students in scientific objective methods of studying human affairs. (1946, pp. 76-77)

This was the lone reference found in this vein. How successful the practice of this theory was has not been documented.

Music professor Henry Brandt described the study of music in terms which seem to be related to scientific method.

> I don't like to call music a discipline. . . . "Craft" is a better term . . . working know-how, meaning an arsenal of skills continually being tested on the job, retained if they work, thrown out if they don't. ("Music," 1974, p. 31)

If this approach were extended to other arts, and made a tool for teaching scientific thinking by making the process Brandt described a conscious one, the arts majors would have had an equal opportunity to be instructed in the art of scientific thought. There is, however, no evidence that this was ever done.

Conclusion. For the science major, there was evidently an emphasis upon scientific thinking. For all non-science majors, there was no defined route for exposing them to that process. The individual might, through science courses, social studies, or through contact with a faculty member who personally held the scientific approach to be important, indeed be introduced to the process of reflective thinking.

No doubt, many were. But this was not a major goal at Bennington, and thus the means for its fulfillment were not constructed as part of the philosophy. As a result, in this part of its Plan and practice, Bennington fails to satisfy the demands of the Model.

Social goals for education. When Dewey talked about education with social goals, he might have had in mind several different levels of interpretation--in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community. Dewey did, indeed, consider all of these valid; but his broad goal for education was that it should serve the society--community in the larger sense. Bennington's interpretation was consistently more limited, concentrating on classroom and campus life. The extensive use of the discussion method in the classroom, coupled with group project work, brought the student into contact with her peers. The small classes that were common and the involvement of the faculty in the counseling system served to diminish the gap between faculty and student. Self-government in the dormitory and through the Community Council and its associated sub-committees was designed to further enrich the student's community life. The Winter Field and Reading Period were also in part intended to expose the young women to the world outside and probably often did so. However, it was not guided with the particular goal of creating for each student a better understanding of the culture. Therefore, the results produced were variable in nature.

Leigh had hoped to orient the general introductory courses around the modern culture in order to achieve this very purpose but had not succeeded. Perhaps the most significant attempt to acquaint

the students with the culture was the "Bennington Survey," one of Leigh's most creative ideas. Collected in the library in several massive volumes, the Survey is an assemblage of numerous student projects relating to different aspects of the town of Bennington. These projects are genuine research efforts, wherein data were gathered, refined, and analyzed. The students involved in these studies (which were initiated in 1933) were surely confronted with a culture greatly different from their own, with social issues unfamiliar to them.

But outside of this one outstanding feature connecting the student with her college town, there was little challenge for these privileged Bennington students to investigate the social issues of the world beyond their isolated hilltop.

Conclusion. There was little evidence that Bennington was committed to an education dedicated to the service of the community, the society. It was, rather, concentrated upon the education of the individual and her life in the classroom and on the campus.

Scientific teaching methods. Dewey's ideas on methods of teaching which embodied modern scientific knowledge have been established. They center around a concern with the experience, interests and needs of the individual, and the active role of the student. The transactional nature of education was also noted. These features of Dewey's thought have become (sometimes with changed qualities) largely the trademarks of progressive education. It is thus logical that Bennington, the capstone of the progressive movement, leaned heavily upon these elements.

In the sections "Life in the Classroom" and "Freedom with

Structure," and generally interspersed throughout the discussion of the Plan, can be found numerous examples of these facets of education at Bennington. Certainly, Bennington students took an active part in their education--from initiating courses, collaborating on class work, evaluating faculty, to designing and carrying out their own programs and projects. The faculty's attention to the student's needs and interests is exemplified in the varying courses created to suit special concerns of individuals, the unconventional nature of majors, the integrated courses.

Teaching styles were close to those actually used in the Dewey School. The general format was the discussion method, usually with no recourse to recitation or lecture techniques, little of the competitive evaluation typical of the traditional classroom. Coverage of subject matter was subjugated to development of principle. Arts were taught as practice as much as, if not more than, as theory. Science used as far as possible the experimental method and Social Studies claimed that as a unifying principle. Below are several illustrations:

> We don't teach music history or what is called musicology. We avoid the gossip-and-hearsay kind of musical speculation which sometimes pass for knowledge . . . We think of the "total Music" in which everyone who is involved is involved first hand by performing music and or creating it. ("Music," 1974, p. 31)

> We learned literature by a close and prolonged study of sample works and by constantly writing. (Livaudois, 1973) [Underlining added.]

> Let's say no one would claim to make poets. But a great deal can be taught about the craft of verse. A few people come together, establish an intellectual and emotional climate wherein creation is possible. They teach each other--that ideal condition of what once was "progressive education." (Roethke, 1973, p. 15)

The guiding philosophy was that education should focus upon the individual. Dewey, as has been pointed out earlier, of course believed that education began with the individual but it did not necessarily follow that education should be "child-centered." His emphasis upon the social goals of education moderated his conception of freedom for the individual. This issue will be examined in the conclusions of the chapter.

Conclusion. There was at Bennington a philosophical and practical dedication to the individual. Teaching methods used were varied, but emphasized an active role for the student with close attention to his experience, interests and needs. A mutual education, where student and professor learned together, was facilitated by the educational practices. In general, Bennington did use the scientific methods of teaching outlined by the Model. It is suggested, however, that the emphasis upon the individual exceeded that which Dewey intended, probably because the underlying philosophy was quite different.

Structure. The Model extrapolated Dewey's philosophy to the college level and postulated that in the process of developing a philosophy for a college, the means for implementing it would be spelled out. To ensure that Dewey's two main aims would be achieved for all and that there would be a progressive development of the power of inquiry in the students, the need for a required system of courses or programs was established.

At Bennington, a system of recommended courses for the first two years was devised to meet its own goals, but it ran into problems

with conflicting aims. Its curriculum recommendations were hostage to its dedication to individual freedom. Rather than defining freedom in Deweyan terms as the power to think reflectively and thus to better control one's destiny, Bennington chose other freedoms for its students. The degree of academic control and direction depended almost exclusively upon the effectiveness of the student committees and the faculty counseling system, a system as fragile as human nature. That it succeeded as well as it did is a comment upon the quality and dedication of the faculty, for upon them fell much of the responsibility.

Apparently later generations of faculty and administration felt the need for more specific requirements. The catalogue for 1974-1976 reads:

> Specific courses are not required at Bennington, but there are educational expectations which students must meet in designing their programs. Because we believe in exploration as well as concentration, students are required to pursue work in four of the eight divisions during their first two years. ("The Bennington Idea," 1974, p. 5) [Underlining added.]

Conclusion. Bennington established a flexible structure to realize its own educational goals. However, the decision to abolish course and program requirements, to substitute a self-directed program without containment within defined structural limits, was contrary to Dewey's practices and theories. It was more in accord with one main stream of progressive thought related to Kilpatrick's philosophy. Therefore, although Bennington was not a campus with untrammeled freedom, neither was it one with a structure based upon Deweyan philosophy.

Specialization. The Model demonstrated the need for a student to focus his studies in a "progressive organization of subject matter" in order

to achieve expertise in the art of inquiry. At the college level, specialization was also seen as a proper tool for vocational purposes.

On one count, Bennington was in accord with the Model. The general Introductory Courses were dedicated to exploratory work which was to assist in selecting a major. The Trial Major served a dual function--a beginning specialization with the option of changing majors if that exploration proved unsatisfactory. Bennington took a firm position in the vocational/cultural controversy of the day. The Plan said:

> Bennington has no sympathy with the false antithesis between vocational and liberal studies . . . The type of intellectual ascetism which fears that contact with practice or reality will destroy the field for culture will be studiously avoided. (pp. 11-12)

The work of the Senior Division was Honors work in a chosen area, although the field may have been in a broad area such as social studies rather than economics or anthropology. Kilpatrick had warned that Bennington was not to be "a narrow vocational school . . . a trade school" ("Conference on Education," Note 5, p. 173).

The motivation for specialization at Bennington was elaborated in the "Announcement for the Second Year."

> The objective is that of gaining a broad but thorough preparation in a field of important adult activity, where there is a real and lasting enthusiasm and interest. Whether in the after college future the field will be entered as a full-time occupation, whether it is to be embraced as a part-time or full-time activity or whether it is to be carried on as an avocation . . . is almost impossible . . . to forecast. . . . Each requires breadth of background, a liberal outlook and a thorough preparation rather than the narrow, trade-school training often associated with vocational work. [Compare Kilpatrick's statement above.] (1933, p. 23)

This perspective was in accord with Leigh's strong concern with the continuing self-education of Bennington's graduates.

Conclusion. Specialization was emphasized at Bennington, as it was in the Model. Again, however, it must be pointed out that while Bennington's reasons for specialization were certainly soundly progressive, they were not closely related to the rationale developed in the Model.

An experimental college. Dewey's concept of education was that it was an experimental process, that an educational system must be constructed with both ends and means as integral features. Therefore, the Model described a Deweyan college as one designed as an experiment, with evaluative processes built into its educational plan.

The literature on Bennington abounds in references to its experimental nature. As the history recorded above shows, it was defined as experimental in its very inception--by Dr. Nielsen, Dr. Graves and Dr. Kilpatrick, each adding a thrust in that direction. But an interesting exchange took place at an early conference in regards to the logical necessity for evaluative procedures for experimental endeavors:

> Mrs. Bernard: Well, Dr. Kilpatrick, I think one thing we can do . . . is to work out some means by which we can test our results.
>
> Professor Kilpatrick: Which is easier said than done.
>
> Bernard: I realize that . . . but any experiment in another field would involve such a thing, wouldn't it? I think one of the defects of our educational system has always been that it was assumed if put a certain method into operation, we would get the best results, but we never found out whether we got it or not.

Kilpatrick: Quite true, and one of the reasons . . . is that you have to wait ten or twenty years and within that . . . period . . . you have a practically infinite number of factors to consider.

Bernard: I recognize the difficulty, but there is all the more reason for working at it.

Kilpatrick: I would agree that somebody ought to work it out, but whether we ought to have our college work it out is another question . . . I think it would take a largely endowed foundation . . .

Bernard: I do not mean to argue.

Kilpatrick: Argue as much as you wish.

("Conference on Education," Note 5, p. 243)

Later in the conference, Kilpatrick proposed (but not for discussion) a scheme whereby funds would be set aside for scholarships for graduate students at "foremost educational teaching centers" such as Columbia. These scholarships recipients were to study problems related to Bennington. The Plan implemented a version of this idea, establishing a goal for an endowment sufficient to provide $7,500 per year for awards to faculty or outside experts for "the kind of thorough study necessary for the successful inauguration of educational experiments and the continuous scientific evaluation of their results in actual operation" (p. 16).

Financial pressures prevented the maturation of this policy. However, evaluation did occur and frequently at Bennington. President Leigh produced various progress reports for sundry audiences. "New Developments in Education" (1935), "A Report to Donors" (1936), "The Sixth Year--Experiment and Evaluation" (1938), "Bennington--A Progress Report," Note 13, and his retirement speech (Note 19) are some

examples.

In addition to Leigh's personal evaluations, Bennington commissioned formal studies at intervals. Eurich and Cornehlsen undertook their two-year study in 1938, a scientifically conceived and carried-out study which influenced the future course of Bennington. Another study was begun in 1938, this one by Soule. Later in 1961, a study was made by a joint committee of faculty and trustees and the results published in what is known as the "Gold Book." Of course, there was also the well-known book on Bennington students written by faculty member Newcomb (1967).

There was however, evidence of an inconsistency in Leigh's conception of the experimental nature of the college. In 1938 he wrote in this purely Deweyan vein:

> The principles and aims [of Bennington] themselves are hypotheses verified by experience. With such a viewpoint neither aims nor methods can remain static. They interact. Examination of practice, examination of results of practices in terms of aims alters practices . . . alters aims. (1938, p. 4)

Dr. Brockway presented a somewhat different view.

> Leigh was a little worried about that idea of experimental, ... He said Bennington was a demonstration of a certain mode of education, and he worried about any one deviating too much . . . (that was when he was going on leave) . . . He was worried what might happen in his absence. He said any change is a very serious matter because of the donors, families, parents, the alumnae--all had in mind this idea of a demonstration. (Note 2)

Indeed, Leigh himself wrote, "[Bennington] might more properly be called a demonstration than an experiment" (1938, p. 3). This is more than a matter of semantics. It points to a fundamental postulate of this study--that Bennington was structured and shaped by its

commitment to "translate into the college field the [progressive] spirit and methods" ("Bennington College," 1932, p. 3).

And in 1958, Leigh made another telling comment relating indirectly to his feeling for change--"[Bennington] is no longer an experiment--it is a time-tested and proven way of college life" (Hyatt, Note 9, p. 52).

Conclusion. Bennington College was consciously organized as an experiment in education and built into its Plan evaluative procedures. However, it was unable to carry out its initial proposals. It instead substituted presidential reviews and external evaluations, as well as faculty/trustee studies. Although its flexibility may be questioned because of its dedication to exemplifying the progressive movement at the college level, it did function in some respects in an experimental mode, particularly at the classroom level, and in the early years.

Summary and Conclusions

Bennington College captured the public imagination in its role as a new and experimental college. It would probably be more accurate to portray it as a demonstration of progressive practices, an extension of the "Kilpatrician" brand of progressivism which focused upon the individual rather than upon Dewey's concepts. The funadamental dedication to this form of progressivism produced numerous deviations from the Model.

There was no primary emphasis upon teaching reflective thinking. Rather there was a general aim of instilling in the student the habit of self-education. The requirement of specialization in a field

was the technique of choice. The social aims of education were also, because of the emphasis upon the individual narrowly focused. Community was in practice essentially defined as classroom and campus. The emphasis upon educating the "whole person" was there and in later years, under Lewis Jones, became even more pronounced as Bennington moved toward General Education.

Science was relegated to a minor role by practice, although not in theory. In the concern with individual freedom, control of structure in curriculum was limited to the purely advisory functions of the counseling system, with one exception: there was an unfailing insistence that each student study some field in depth, to specialize.

Criticism of this facet of education at Bennington can be offered. Self-criticism emerged in the "Gold Book." The complaint was made that the "educational counseling committees have permitted weak students to choose weak programs while discouraging strong students from choosing strong ones." There were, it continued, "sentimental confusions about student freedom and about tailoring every program to a student's inner needs" (p. 14). The educational system was inefficient, it stated, because of the applications, not because of its premises (Note 21, p. 9). Again, it might be suggested that had Dewey's educational philosophy guided the college more effectively, this particular difficulty would have been avoided.

There were elements in the Bennington philosophy that appear to be rooted in thinking akin to that of Rousseau and those who built educational systems upon his concepts. When Emile was written in 1762, many of the techniques and ideas just seen in practice at Bennington

were presented as innovations by Rousseau--the emphasis upon individual differences, the idea that growth builds upon native interests and curiosity, that education must come through the senses, through individual activity. The grounding precept was that the development of the child was a natural process, proceeding according to his antecedent characteristics. Like a seed, the student will bloom if only given the freedom to do so. Control of this natural process is then logically in opposition to nature (Rousseau, 1762, 1969).

To be sure, there was no discussion of Rousseauan philosophy in the literature concerning Bennington. However, one may suggest that the progressive education which it purported to demonstrate in itself leaned heavily in many respects on the thinking found in Emile. This hypothesis will be developed in more detail in the later chapters as the other colleges in the sample are investigated, and in the concluding chapter.

Whatever the weaknesses of the organizational system at Bennington, there was displayed much of that which Dewey attempted in his own laboratory, the Dewey School. The inclusion of the arts in the curriculum is an outstanding example. Bennington's teaching methods demonstrate the strongest point of overlap between progressivism and Deweyan philosophy. Their great variety and creativity alone give Bennington a secure position in the history of progressive education.

But the final conclusion must be that in most respects, Bennington's progressivism was not closely allied to Dewey's philosophy.

Reference Notes

1. Proceedings: Bennington College conference. Bennington, Vermont. June 20-21, 1930. Typewritten. (Bennington archives)

2. Brockway, T. Personal interview, June 15, 1980.

3. College heads favor plans for a new institution. Bennington Banner and Reformer, October 3, 1923. (Clipping found in Bennington archives. No page numbers.)

4. Addresses at Colony Club. April 28, 1924. Typewritten copy in Dr. Thomas Brockway's files.

5. Conference of Educators. Held under the auspices of the Committee of Twenty-One at Hall Farm, (Residence of Mrs. J.G. McCullough), North Bennington, Vt., in re: The establishment of a woman's college. August 29-30, 1924. (Bennington archives)

6. Mattuck, R. Personal interview, June 4, 1980.

7. Leigh, R.D. The educational plan for Bennington College. (Revised edition . . . First edition issued March, 1929.) New York: Bennington College, 1931. (Bennington archives)

8. Comments. (A collection of printed comments from educators on the Educational Plan. Found attached to a copy of the Plan in the Bennington archives.)

9. Hyatt, D. Toward an ideal liberal arts college. Apparently a paper done for a course (Ed. 326 MI.), May 14, 1958. It includes personal interviews with former presidents Burkhardt and Leigh. Typewritten. (Bennington archives)

10. College institutes series: John Dewey memorial lectures. Bennington Biweekly, June 6, 1952, p. 1.

11. Woodworth, R. Personal interview, June 15, 1980.

12. C.L.M. Galley Three, November, 1955. No page number. Apparently a short-lived student publication. Single page. (Bennington archives)

13. Leigh, R.D. Bennington--A progress report. (A printed report of a speech made by Dr. Leigh to the Association of Headmasters, February 25, 1938. Probably used as a publicity pamphlet.) (Bennington archives)

14. Eurich, A., & Evans, C. Bennington College, An evaluation. November, 1942. Typewritten report.

15. Flexner, A. Letter to "You Dear Swans." October 21, 1930. Typewritten. (Bennington archives)

16. Revised building and financial program. September 15, 1930. Typewritten. (Bennington archives)

17. Soule, G. Educational experimentation: A study focused on Bennington College. September, 1961. Typewritten report.

18. Bennington College--Success of an educational experiment. November, 1949. (Printed. Probably a promotional pamphlet. Bennington archives.)

19. Leigh, R.D. Remarks of President Robert D. Leigh to Bennington College faculty and staff. August 10, 1941. (This was his retirement speech. Typewritten, with handwritten corrections. Bennington archives.)

20. Bennington College asks your help in meeting its needs. (The first eight years and the future), 1940. (Printed pamphlet. Bennington archives)

21. Report to the faculty and trustees of Bennington College. April, 1961. (Commonly referred to as the "Gold Book." Results of a study carried out by a joint committee of faculty and trustees to explore the future of the college. Bennington archives.)

22. Cornehlsen, J.J., Jr. The development of the junior division curriculum at Bennington College. (Report on a two year study, 1939-41. Typewritten. Bennington archives.)

Reference List

Announcement for the second year. Bennington College Bulletin, 1933-34.

Benezet, L.T. General education in the progressive college. New York: Arno, 1971. (Originally published, 1943.)

Bennington College. Bennington College Bulletin, 1932-33, pp. 3-19.

The Bennington idea. Bennington College Bulletin, 1974-76, pp. 3-11.

Brockway, T. Notes from the year one. Bennington College Quadrille, Fall, 1979, pp. 7-9.

Brockway, T. Science at Bennington in the Leigh era. Bennington College Quadrille, Spring, 1977, pp. 21-27.

Brockway, T. In the beginning. It was September, 1932, and no one knew. Bennington College Quadrille, Winter, 1979, pp. 8-13.

Burkhardt, F. The Bennington experience. Bennington College Alumnae Magazine, Autumn, 1957, p. 21.

Cottrell, D. General education in experimental liberal arts colleges. In National Society for the Study of Education 38'th Yearbook, Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1939.

Coulson, R. Yale takes a look at Bennington. Bennington Weekly, March 30, 1951, p. 1.

Crighton, J. Stephens: A story of educational innovation. Columbus, Mo.: American Press, 1970.

Dewey, J. Art as experience. New York: Minton, Balch, 1934.

The experimental college. School and Society, February 21, 1931, pp. 265-266.

Foster, C. Excursions where "Fancy" led. Bennington College Quadrille, Fall, 1972, pp. 11-12.

Frankenthaler, H. Sometimes all the magic ends converge. Bennington College Quadrille, Fall, 1972, pp. 37-40.

Gray, C. A summary of the Dean's report to the trustees of Bard College. Bard College Bulletin, December, 1940.

Hanna, A.J. The founding of Rollins College. Rollins College Bulletin, December, 1935, pp. v, 1-51.

Holt, H. The Rollins idea. The Nation, October 8, 1930, pp. 372-373.

Jones, B. Bennington College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946.

Jones, L. Comments on general education. (Speech at the college community meeting, August 26, 1945) Bennington College Bulletin, September, 1945, pp. 5-17.

Kilpatrick, W.H. Letter (sent to individuals in response to inquiries about Bennington). Reprinted in McCullough, E. Recollections, Bennington College Bulletin, June 1957, pp. 71-78. Also reprinted in Appendix A1. Dated 1926.

Kilpatrick, W.H. Reminiscences of Dewey and his influence. In W. Brickman & S. Lehrer (Eds.), John Dewey: Master educator. New York: Atherton Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1959.)

Kirkpatrick, J.J. The Antioch faculty. The Nation, October 22, 1930, pp. 441-443.

Leigh, R.D. The educational plan for Bennington College: Revised edition. New York: Bennington College, 1931.

Leigh, R.D. A new college. (Speech) In Proceedings of the 9'th annual meeting, March 1st-3rd, 1928, Boston: National Association of Principals of Schools for Girls, 1928.

Leigh, R.D. New developments in education at Bennington College. School and Home, April, 1935, pp. 664-667.

Leigh, R.D. A report to donors. Bennington College Bulletin, November, 1936, pp. 8-11.

Leigh, R.D. The sixth year--Experiment and evaluation. Bennington College Bulletin, May, 1938, pp. 3-6.

Leuba, C.J. A road to creativity. North Quincy, Massachusetts: Christopher Publishing Co., 1971.

Leyden, R. The Stephen's College Program. In W.H. Sticker (Ed.), Experimental colleges. Tallahasee: Florida State University, 1964.

Livaudais, C. Editor's note. (Guest editor.) Bennington College Quadrille, Winter/Spring, 1973.

McCullough, E. Recollections. Bennington College Bulletin, June, 1957, pp. 13-47.

McCullough, J. Recollections on recollecting recollections. Bennington College Quadrille, Fall, 1972, pp. 4-7.

Music is a kind of psychic armor: an interview with Henry Brandt and Jacob Glick. Bennington College Quadrille, Spring, 1974, pp. 31-35.

National Society for the Study of Education. Changes and experiments in liberal-arts education. 31'st Yearbook, Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1932.

Newcomb, T. Persistence and change. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Oldt, E. Antioch College as an experimental institution. In W.H. Sticker (Ed.), Experimental colleges. Tallahasee: Florida State University, 1964.

Roethke, T. The teaching poet. Bennington College Quadrille, Winter, 1973, pp. 15-17.

Rousseau, J. Emile. New York: Dutton, 1969. (B. Foxley, Trans.) (Originally published, 1762.)

Rudolph, F. The American college and university: A history. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Science major. Bennington College Bulletin, May 1936, pp. 17-18.

Tennenbaum, S. William Heard Kilpatrick: Trail blazer in education. New York: Harper, 1951.

CHAPTER V

SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE

What kind of a college is Sarah Lawrence? The answers that have been given in the years since 1928 reflect the conflicting images of this college that have persisted from one generation to another. In 1974, the men at Yale declared it to be "the most progressive college in the country and the most pleasant open-air sanatorium in New York State" (Yale Daily News, 1974, p. 164). In what appears to be half derision and half envy, the editors listed "amazing academic reforms"--no grades (only confidential reports); no specific requirements for graduation; no majors; no examinations. The girls, it was stated, are "all very interesting, alive, experienced, and intelligent, but . . . most of them are somewhat neurotic, and a few quite crazy. . . . Sarah Lawrence girls are different, really different" (p. 165).

Much of this report was factually accurate. Sarah Lawrence did at its inception institute "amazing reforms" for that time. That Yale men of the seventies found them so startling may reflect questionably upon their understanding of educational change over the years. Yet it was by the efforts of another man who was described by a leading educator as "a complete novice" in education ("Conversation," Note 1, p. 4) that Sarah Lawrence came to flourish upon its hilly campus in Bronxville. A review of the course of events leading from William Van Duzer Lawrence, business man and real-estate developer, to Sarah

Lawrence, sophisticated college for wealthy young women, illuminates the educational processes of the times, reveals an ambivalent concept of women, gives impetus to a general theme of this study--the gulf between progressive and Deweyan philosophy.

The Founding of Sarah Lawrence

The sequence of events. William Lawrence was himself not a member of an affluent family. Born on a farm in New York in 1842, he grew up in Michigan, attended (but did not graduate from) Kalamazoo College, leaving it to seek in New York City a livelihood which would allow him to care for his family still in Michigan (McDonough, Note 2, Introduction, p. 3). After marriage, he lived for some time in Canada during the 1880's, but returned to New York in 1887. An article by two Sarah Lawrence alumnae recreated his first visit to the Bronxville hills destined to be home to Sarah Lawrence College.

> One fine day in the 1890's, William Van Duzer Lawrence boarded one of the cars on the New York Central Railroad running out of New York City into the wilds of Westchester to visit his two sons who were boarding at a home on the White Plains Road. He was at this time in his late forties, an impressive, dignified figure who was well-established financially. . . . All accounts seem to agree that Mr. Lawrence's first reaction to Bronxville was one of irritation. He was obliged to sit in the old station . . . waiting for transportation which never appeared. In desperation he made the entire distance . . . on foot. In the course of the walk he found it necessary several times to crawl through underbrush and wild blackberry bushes. (Bower & Brooks, Note 3, p. 1)

Later he was convinced to inspect the old Prescott place, a sagging farmhouse with "trees and bushes . . . and cow paths winding around huge boulders." On this land he built (1914-1916) an impressive Elizabethan-Tudor mansion to serve as the family home. There he and

his family lived and there Sarah Lawrence died suddenly in May of 1926.

During those last years at Westlands, as the country home was called, Lawrence, now into his eighties, was considering the future of his cherished estate; wishing it to be put to some productive use in the community where he had acquired much of his wealth; determined that it should not be "just another oversized house to be demolished or sold for taxes" (Lawrence, Note 4, p. 2). Several options were explored, among them the establishment of a boarding school for boys. Eventually, largely through pressures exerted by President MacCracken of Vassar, Lawrence settled upon a junior college for women.

MacCracken, in a sometimes testy interview with President Constance Warren of Sarah Lawrence, has left a record of the forces that finally focused Lawrence's attention upon a women's college. He recalled how his first association with Lawrence occured. During a fund-raising campaign for Vassar in 1915-16, MacCracken became acquainted with Louise Lawrence, graduate of Vassar and daughter of Lawrence.

> [Louise] was president of the Alumnae Association during the campaign . . . I met with her frequently . . . and I actually met her father then. Seeing that he was a gentlemen [sic] of some means--had a rather handsome home in New York on Fifth Avenue, or near it--I marked him down in my mind's eye, as a college president inevitably does. I visited him later and asked him for funds for this college of which his daughter was so prominent a graduate. And he said, "No, I have made up my mind to do something. I do not know what." ("Conversation, Note 1, p. 2)

In 1924, MacCracken and Lawrence communicated further. By this time Lawrence was considering the boy's school, an idea which

MacCracken discouraged. In its place, he suggested a junior college for women, attached to a boarding school, a temporary tactic on the part of MacCracken, it appears.

> I believed at that time that it was a way of reaching him [Lawrence] in his present stage of thinking. He liked that idea, and . . . I tried to wean him of the idea of having a [secondary] school at all and going in wholeheartedly for the full two years of junior college. (p. 4)

When Mrs. Lawrence died, her husband decided that a junior college for women would indeed be a fitting memorial; he characteristically took rapid action to convert the concept into fact. A charter was obtained; the imminence of Sarah Lawrence College was announced.

The story goes that this news took President Butler of Columbia completely by surprise. In response, he angrily threatened Mr. Lawrence:

> He said, in substance, "You can't start a college in the New York area unless it is with my consent, and I don't consent. And I can put an end to Sarah Lawrence College." (p. 2)[1]

Thereupon, Lawrence immediately sought an affiliation with Vassar. MacCracken recalled that by then, Lawrence was an ailing old man, letting go of his wealth, seeking guidance and support for his educational venture (p. 3).[2]

The Lawrence family also was concerned for several reasons,

---

[1]Later, MacCracken reported, Butler invited Lawrence to give Sarah Lawrence to Columbia as a junior college affiliated with it, an offer rejected by Mr. Lawrence, It is, however, revealing to note that Butler pursued this train of thought, "acquiring" St. Stephen's in 1928, supporting vigorously its conversion into the progressive college Bard.

[2]MacCracken recalled that Lawrence wrote to him: "I feel like the captain that has launched a ship without either sails, mast, or rudder. Now you must provide these for me" (p. 3).

among them Lawrence's advanced age. They strongly opposed the whole idea of Sarah Lawrence. Dudley Lawrence justified their active opposition:

> It was . . . the family opinion that while Mr. Lawrence's mind remained clear and active, his judgement was impaired by reason of age . . . and that at eighty-two it was too late for him to personally undertake the erection of the College as he proposed to do. (Lawrence, Note 4, p. 4)

In fact, Arthur Lawrence, the elder son, sought expensive legal counsel in an effort to block the founding of the college (McDonough, Note 2, p. 4). But Lawrence (with a one-track mind similar to that of Woodrow Wilson, his son commented) persisted. A Board of Trustees (excluding any Lawrence sons) was chosen; candidates for President were suggested by MacCracken. On May 16, 1927, Mr. Lawrence died; no actual construction had begun on campus. An opening data had been announced--September, 1928; President Coats had been appointed on December 7, 1926 and had been working with Lawrence. A campus of 12 acres had been provided, as well as Westlands, a gardener's cottage, a stable, and securities valued at $750,000 (Warren, Note 5, p. 1). However, the economic situation of the times made it impossible to sell the securities for the cash needed for building. The future of Sarah Lawrence was far from assured.

President Coats and MacCracken made the decision to support the continuation of the project. MacCracken, with the wisdom of a fund-raising President, convinced Dudley Lawrence to join the Board of Trustees and together they and other influential trustees found financial backing for the college. It opened on schedule in 1928 with a full

student body of 210 young women ("A Brief History," Note 6, p. 1). However, at the end of the first year, President Coats was replaced by Constance Warren, who remained until 1945. This is the period of most interest to this study.

The developing philosophy. At the outset, Lawrence had only diffuse concepts of the educational goals of his proposed college. What was clear in his mind, after the death of his wife, was that the college should be a reflection of her life-long concerns. In Canada, Mrs. Lawrence had helped to found the Young Women's Christian Association; in New York she had involved herself with the New York Exchange for Women's Work, an outlet for the handicraft of poor women. In Florida, she was active in the organization of Bethune Institute, a school for Negroes (McDonough, Note 2, Introduction, pp. 2-3). Lawrence's early contacts with MacCracken seemed to promise an avenue commensurate with his needs. His attention was drawn by the "new" education growing in the sector of the secondary school and there appeared vistas of an educational adventure in its application to higher education.[3] Although frequent references in later Sarah Lawrence records refer to the progressive ideas of their Founder, it was actually MacCracken who established the educational philosophy of Sarah Lawrence. Probably his influence was reinforced by (or his progressive bent itself was in part due to) the publicity which Ravi-Booth and Leigh were generating with

---

[3]Constance Warren remarked that in reading Lawrence's recollections she "got the idea that he was a man who liked adventure. . . . and that he would be far more stimulated by the fact that [MacCracken] wanted to do something a little new and different, than anything else" ("Conversation," Note 1, pp. 3-4).

their proposals for Bennington College. In fact, Lawrence was so attracted to Ravi-Booth's early suggestions that he at one time offered Sarah Lawrence College and Westlands to him. (See Chapter IV, footnote 1.)

MacCracken and Coats. At any event, MacCracken provided a strong impetus in the direction of progressive education. The source of his own interest can not be exactly defined. It might be that he and Leigh were pursuing parallel tracks, impelled by the educational processes of the time. Professor Will Hamlin of Goddard College suggested that MacCracken's motivation may have been based upon a desire to effect change in the education of women in ways not possible at an established college such as Vassar (Hamlin, Note 7, p. 32). A later President, Harrison Tweed said, "Rumor has it that he accepted [the Chairmanship of the Board of Trustees] so that he might do here the educational pioneering which he had found it impossible to do up the river" (Tweed, Note 8, p. 2). Or perhaps it was simply that, as MacCracken expressed it, "progressive education was in the air" ("Conversation," Note 1, p. 4) and MacCracken was in the thick of it. He carefully recalled his many connections with the new movement. The organizational meeting of the Progressive Education Association was held at Vassar with MacCracken in attendence. He was in touch with their first President, Mrs. Queene Ferry Coonley. He also recalled certain progressive faculty at Vassar during his days as President--Miss Wylie, "a very progressive woman" and Miss Buck, "one of the first to introduce participation by the students in the control of the classroom"

(pp. 4-5)[4,5]

MacCracken also proclaimed a deep interest in Dewey. He recounted this noteworthy episode:

> I also was a reader of John Dewey and his philosophy. I attended his lectures and invited him to lecture at Vassar College. I was very sorry to have to refuse his daughter's admission because he, like a good professor, had forgotten to register in time, and I could not make any exception. But Mr. Dewey was very friendly with Vassar College and his beliefs were shared up here. (pp. 4-5)

MacCracken's particular interest in the junior college concept was also part and parcel of the educational trends of the times, for the junior college was already well established in the West. MacCracken spoke of a conference which he attended at Bradford Academy, a conference on progressive education. The Head of the Academy at the time was Miss Coats, a graduate of Vassar; she was considering the establishment of a junior college there. MacCracken wrote:

> I presented a fairly complete idea of its organization and studies, its aims and the method by which those aims could be to some extent obtained. And it interested Miss Coats and the others there. (p. 5)

Although this recollection seems designed to subordinate Miss

---

[4]MacCracken tempered his admiration of Miss Buck's "complete freedom" by noting that "each freshman class each year voted unanimously to study Walter Pater. Now that was not too natural a choice, you know, for a group of freshmen; I suspected a hand guiding the votes indirectly" ("Conversation," Note 1, p. 5).

[5]The affiliation of Vassar with Sarah Lawrence was largely through a joint Board of Trustees, with MacCracken at the head. This Board, MacCracken insisted, had a strong progressive bent. "They [the Vassar trustees] were all of them progressive leaders in their own areas." He named, among others, Frances Park and John Lionberger Davis, a leader in progressive education in St. Louis for a generation, (pp. 9, 15). MacDonough added to this list of early progressive trustees Burton Fowler, President of the PEA in 1930 and Ruth Hornblower Atkins, a trustee of the Shady Hill School of Progressive Education (Note 2, p. 3).

Coat's role in promoting the junior college idea for Sarah Lawrence,[6] it was her Bradford Plan that was developed for the College.[7]

A later statement prepared by MacCracken for the first catalog expanded upon his reasons for considering the junior college plan a sound educational venture. It was his experience at Vassar that many of the young women left during the course of the first two years, often for marriage. As a consequence, the real work of the traditional university was never encountered, since it was usual for the advanced studies to be delayed until the last years of the curriculum. Students not interested in such training as the preliminary two years afforded then tended to refrain from enrolling at any college, finding no suitable avenue for the particular education that they desired.

> To cope with this situation the new type of junior college seems warranted as an experiment. Most junior colleges hitherto have been institutions supplementary to the public education system, giving certain collegiate advantages to students unable to leave the city . . . , or else have been supplementary to the state university, reducing the number of applicants and sending the more serious-minded students to their upper years in the central faculty. . . . For the East, the junior college purely of the cultural type, devoted to

---

[6]MacCracken said: "The earliest correspondence [with Lawrence] in my file goes back to July 30, 1924. In November of that year Mr. Lawrence got his lawyer, Mr. Frederic Geller. . . . We had correspondence for some time with him. In my letter of November 25 of that year, I recommended this lawyer to study the catalogues of Bradford College, Packer Institute and Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri. I had visited all these institutions at that time. This I believe, precedes any correspondence of Mr. Lawrence with Miss Coats and was the earliest consultation that he had with any educational person on a junior college" (pp. 1-2).

[7]McDonough's research revealed that Miss Coats "wrote to MacCracken in 1926 asking if he wanted to design the school's policy and if so, she would agree with his plans. In response he suggested that Miss Coats develop a plan for the college and he would oversee it" (McDonough, Note 2, Chapter 3, p. 5).

> meeting the needs of those who desire two years of college work and organizing its curriculum along the lines of progressive education, may prove to be the most helpful addition to the institutions of higher learning. (MacCracken, 1927-28, p. 6) [Underlining added.]

It was upon this general framework that Miss Coats built her design for the new Sarah Lawrence, guided by conferences with Lawrence and MacCracken.[8] And thus Lawrence became the progressive Founder so often spoken of at Sarah Lawrence over the years. His Letter of Instruction to the Board of Trustees and to "others concerned in the management of the Sarah Lawrence College" was in effect the equivalent of Leigh's Plan for Bennington. It has been offered as evidence of Lawrence's progressive philosophy; but MacCracken recalled: "Our [Miss Coats' and MacCracken's] second piece of work was the composition of Mr. Lawrence's letter to the Board of Trustees" (p. 7). This statement, if indeed based upon an accurate recollection, makes it difficult to separate the thinking of Lawrence from that of his advisors. But the description of the course of study, at least whole-heartedly accepted by Lawrence if not original with him, clearly shows the marks of the progressive education movement. The characteristic elements were there: an emphasis upon the tutorial plan, small classes, a minimum of teaching by the lecture method, an emphasis too upon the liberal arts rather than science or languages, attention to the building of sound principles rather than the acquisition of knowledge. There was great stress upon the Fine Arts. "If any courses should be required,

---

[8] In August of 1926, she spent a week at Westlands, "certainly an interesting one," she wrote to MacCracken. She detailed preparations for a meeting with the Board of Regents and requested an opportunity to confer with MacCracken ("Conversation," Note 1, p. 7).

they should be chosen from the field of the fine arts" (Lawrence, Note 9, p. 5).

One wonders about the actual authorship of this section and of another dedicated to a discussion of the junior college. One also reads with interest another portion stressing training in the proper attitudes on life:

> No courses of study afford greater opportunities for such training than do the Fine Arts. There is an intimate connection between cultivated taste and high moral principle. (p. 5)

Upon reading Miss Coats' statement for the first catalog, one is struck by the similarities evident.

> Keener powers of appreciation must be developed and canons of good taste, more uniform and of indisuptable authority must be set up. . . . We have seen the impress of bad taste repeatedly in modern society. We know the foundations of it are laid in a desire for excitement and an instinctive recognition of the lurid and the striking. . . . The facts should be taken . . . as symptomatic of the disease in education--an atrophy of the powers of appreciation--due to the neglect of colleges which subordinate a craving for beauty. (Coats, 1927-28, pp. 13-14)

> Much earlier in the education of our youth, we must begin to stress beauty, to define harmony, to teach that evil in all its forms is unbeautiful. . . . If any subjects are to be "required" in this new sort of college, they should be chosen from the field of fine arts . . . Strength and fineness of character are in some way intimately connected with cultivated powers of appreciation. (pp. 14, 16)

Perhaps these were just common concerns of Coats and Lawrence. He was, it has been reported, a great lover of the arts and of beauty. Bower and Brooks wrote:

> In his first thoughts beauty was the dominant note. He wanted beauty in everything, not only in architecture and landscaping, but also in the young student body to be, and, as Miss Marion Coats, the first president later declared, even in the faculty. (Note 3, p. 1)

Lawrence said himself that he hoped that "there may be built up here at

Westlands the most beautiful small college in America (Lawrence, Note 9, p. 7).

Examination of Miss Coats' year at Sarah Lawrence lends some credence to a related hypothesis that her progressiveness was not thoroughly assimilated into her educational philosophy, that she may well have been adapting the thinking of MacCracken and of Lawrence. The facts are that in her administration of the college she instituted practices incompatible with progressive philosophy. McDonough has suggested that "Coats' interest in Progressive Education tended to mask her conservatism which revealed itself during her first year at Sarah Lawrence"(Note 2, Chapter III, p. 6). Conflicts arose over a number of issues, revolving around the interpretation of Lawrence's policies spelled out in his Letter to the Trustees. President Coats proved to be inflexible in her handling of these conflicts.

> Her rigid attitudes, administrative problems and overspending her budget produced a severe split with the faculty. Her decision to dismiss some faculty members who disagreed with her met with disapproval from Dr. MacCracken. As a result, she resigned in July 1929. (p. 7)

Her successor Miss Warren later pointed out two of Coats' practices which she discontinued after taking office--two which were in obvious conflict with good progressive education. One was the requirement instituted by Coats that "each instructor . . . prepare in advance a syllabus of the work to be covered in his [sic] course," along with detailed descriptions of desired goals (ten at least) and indications of the minimum material to be mastered (Coats, Note 10, p. 4). Miss Doerschuk, Director of Education, explaining the characteristics of Sarah Lawrence as a progressive college, noted that:

> A syllabus prepared in advance was bound to be quite incompatible with adjustment of work to individual needs for training and for the development of interests. (Doerschuk, 1933, p. 2)

A second feature of Coats' administration that was deemphasized by President Warren was the unusual stipulation that each student reserve not less than eight hours a week for the pursuit of a leisure activity of her choice.[9] She was further expected to file a formal report on the activity each week. Miss Warren wrote about the reasons for the discontinuance of this practice:

> The faculty came to feel that this created an artificial and often a hypocritical attitude toward a subject about which the student should feel free. Enforced leisure-time pursuits savor too much of required work. Therefore the insistence upon a definite number of hours weekly to be so used was given up, but a wide variety of leisure time opportunities are pointed out each year, the leisure in which to make use of them is guarded. (Warren, Note 5, p. 209)

---

[9]The Student Handbook in 1930 presented the following under the heading Leisure Time Activities: Eight hours a week of leisure is a requirement of the academic course. The object of these activities is to train the students in spending the leisure hours to profitable advantage. . . . During 1929-1930 leisure time activities were as follows:

Art Appreciation
Art Club (invitations only)
Athletics
Crafts: block printing
costume design
jewelry
pottery
weaving
Current Literature Reading Clubs
Dancing
Discussion Groups
French Conversation
Gardening Club
Glee Club (invitation only)
History Club (invitation only)
Literary Clubs
Management of Finances
Modeling
Orchestra
Pantomine
Piano
Piano Ensemble
Photography Clubs
Poetry Anthology
Religions and Social Discussion Groups
Seeing New York Trips
Shakespeare (acting)
Shorthand
Singers
Speech Training
Star Study
Student Committee Work
Typewriting
Violin
Voice

("Leisure time activities," 1930-31, pp. 58-59)

Still another example of an aspect of Coats' design for education which was more restrictive than the progressives expected was the establishment of rather specific requirements for the granting of a diploma, later also much modified ("The Aims and Offerings of Sarah Lawrence," 1927-28, pp. 17-18).

McDonough's research led her to conclude that it was Warren who defined and implemented progressive educational policies at Sarah Lawrence, a conclusion which the data strongly support (Note 2, Chapter III, p. 7). Until Miss Warren took charge, a consistent philosophy of education was missing. Accordingly, this study, as it measures Sarah Lawrence against the Model, will use the education that developed under President Warren as characteristic of the college during its first decade.

However, before proceeding to that particular topic, a consideration of certain problems encountered by Miss Warren, having their roots in this earlier period, is worth undertaking. One of her most important tasks was that of correcting the public image of the college. Much adverse publicity had been generated during the Lawrence and Coats' years; it was an issue towards which the new President was quite sensitive.[10] As might be expected, much of the furore centered about the views of education for women held by the planners of the school.

---

[10]Miss Warren and MacCracken, in the course of their discussion in 1961 ("Conversation," Note 1), more than thirty years after Warren's assumption of the Presidency, referred several times to the label given Sarah Lawrence in the early days--that of "a charm school." MacCracken mentioned: "I was asked [in 1926] what kind of a college it would be, and gave an interview to the press. The reporters at once jumped to the fact that it would be a charm school" (p. 8). Warren recalled that the representatives of an accrediting agency were

There is evidence of considerable inconsistency leading to confusion on campus and off. The "new" education of women was seriously threatened by the common view of Sarah Lawrence that emerged. It is apparent recalling the 1974 reaction of the Yale men, that some of these older impressions still persist.

The public view of Sarah Lawrence. Warren in 1961 mentioned this issue. She wrote that "the publicity . . . was twisted a great deal at first, of course, and we had to live that down" (Note 1, p. 20). That complaint was tactfully worded and probably considerably understated. The press had not been overly receptive to the kind of college that had been presented to them. No less a personage than Heywood Broun had taken the opportunity in December of 1926 to speculate upon the nature of the new college.

> I have grave doubts of the success of that college which the old gentleman purposes to found in Bronxville. Sarah Lawrence University, as you may have read, will be designed to prepare young women for matrimony. (Broun, 1926, p. 1)

He continued in a sharply satirical vein, bemoaning the plight of a mythical student, Ruth Gilman.

> [Ruth] hemmed atrociously and her Womanliness was something terrible. . . . She basted badly and only with the help of printed notes. In the early autumn of her sophomore year it was the plan of the faculty to expel Ruth, and send her packing so that she should not move about the world as a failure who had brought disgrace upon Lawrence College. (p. 5)

Other reflections of this derisive attitude can be observed. Bower and Banks' article featured a sub-title--Founds College for Idle

---

"perfectly willing to accept this queer new college which was 'no charm school' " (p. 9). Also, "We were the youngest and according to the public, the most ridiculous college, a "charm school" (p. 14).

Wives (Note 3, p. 1). Warren, in 1940, again commented:

> No marks, no lectures, no recitations, no exams, no textbooks. No wonder it sounds like a country club to many who know nothing about modern education but these spectacular half truths. A country club! How that jibe used to sting and still does! (Warren, 1940, p. 12)

The leaven for such unfriendly effusions, boiling about the college even before it opened, was essentially provided by Lawrence himself. For example, an early entry in his Notebook read:

> The college should teach the art of home building, the rearing of children, the moulding of character, these should precede all other requirements. (Lawrence, Note 4, p. 6)

McDonough, who perceived a distressing ambivalence in Lawrence's concept of women, has quoted him as follows:

> I don't think women and girls need a man's education, but that is what most of them get. So much time is devoted to sports that women who leave college find themselves unfitted for marriage, which is their real career. (Note 2, Chapter III, p. 3)

The reports of Lawrence's concern with the beauty of campus, student body, and faculty (discussed above) reveal an attitude quite unacceptable to the present generation of women, an attitude that even then scarcely fitted the image of a new education for women. Equally unacceptable was the repeated insistence that the education of women should be to provide training in the use of leisure time. This was not just a passing fancy. The idea persisted in modified form for some years and certainly contributed to the critical public image of the college. Yet this concept was not without some degree of consistency with other of Lawrence's policies. In fact, it was a logical consequence of the proposed constituency of the college, a concept which itself

incorporated Lawrence's conservative view of women and their education.

The basic implied premise was that this school would provide a new education, not for all women, but for young women of both wealth and social standing. It began with Lawrence's determination, recorded in his Notebook, that

> The College is to be a self-supporting institution restricted to students able and willing to pay for their education. (Lawrence, Note 4, p. 5)

Since the fees for each of the first six years were set at $1,600 (with extra charges of $200-300 for art or music courses, which were strongly emphasized) (Warren, Note 5, p. 11), there was one inherent specification for admission. The student must have no financial concerns.

Lawrence wrote:

> The College, being highly restricted, must necessarily be high priced and somewhat more expensive in its construction, maintenance and management than the average institution of its kind. But I believe these standards are in keeping with the community in which the college is located [Westchester County] and with the type of home from which this special group is to be chosen. (Note 9, p. 3) [Underlining added.]

An additional expectation was spelled out in this Letter to the Trustees. In his discussion of the student body, under the heading Restrictions, appears this statement:

> [The students] are to be selected from homes which are genuinely American. . . . It is my wish that the group may be as homogeneous as possible, that parents may have the satisfaction of knowing with whom their daughters are associating. . . . Moreover, this college is located in a restricted section in the suburbs of a great city: the clientele of the college should be acceptable to the rest of the community round about it. (pp. 3-4) [Underlining added.]

By these selective devices, Lawrence ensured an elite student body, drawn from families possessing wealth and status. Accepting this

basis, it was then not inconsistent to propose, as he did, as a major goal of the college a training which would give these privileged young women an appreciation of the value of leisure and the ability to make profitable use of it (p. 5). This background also makes more understandable Coats' subsequent emphasis (related above) upon the training of the powers of appreciation and the reinforcing of the canons of good taste.

It was Miss Warren who eventually had to cope with the not-surprising public reaction to such pronouncements. Some of the consequences were not amenable to change. For instance, a 1938 publication complained that due to the high fees charged, applicants of the greatest promise were regularly turned down because of an inability to pay ("A Statement," Note 11, p. 34). Warren herself candidly reported that it was usual for many of the young women entering the freshman class to be considered by the Admissions Committee to be unsuitable candidates, admitted because their tuition was essential to a balanced budget.

> The presence of approximately a quarter of the student body who lack both the intelligence and the motivation for this work prevents our getting other good applicants, lowers the morale of the rest of the student body, and jeopardizes the distinctive educational contribution of the college. (Note 5, p. 58)

Miss Warren proposed an enlarged scholarship system to provide a wider range of student body--a step which would negate Lawrence's wish to maintain a homogeneous grouping of young women on campus. She recalled that Lawrence had expressed the hope that a scholarship fund be established. (This seems another inconsistent aspect of Lawrence's

policies.) She regretted that little progress had been made in this respect, in that at that time (1936) only about 8% of Sarah Lawrence students were receiving scholarship assistance, comparing unfavorably with 36 and 50% at Bennington and Black Mountain, respectively (p. 58).[11]

There were some changes which were effected by Warren in the years that she spent at Sarah Lawrence, changes that made the college more respectable from a progressive viewpoint. How far her adaptations brought education there into coherence with Dewey's philosophy will be the topic of the next section of this paper. Again, it should be noted that comparisons with the Model will be based upon the Sarah Lawrence that emerged while Warren was there, for even a superficial examination

---

[11] She recorded the following data on the Scholarship Fund:

	Total	Nos. Awarded
1928-29		none
1929-30		none
1930-31		none
1931-32	$ 4,500	8
1932-33	16,450	30
1933-34	19,480	36
1934-35	12,195	21
1935-36	16,959	27

(p. 10)

A later college publication gave these figures for 1935-36:

College	Fees	Per Cent on Scholarship	Total Awarded
Wellesley	$1,000	23	$ 85,000
Smith	1,000	26	199,465
Mount Holyoke	1,000	35	82,771
Vassar	1,200	24	134,000
Bennington	1,675	36	50,320
Sarah Lawrence	1,700	10	16,956

("A Statement," Note 11, p. 35)

The author noted that such figures as these made it difficult to refute the frequent charge that education at Sarah Lawrence was a perogative of the rich only (p. 33).

of the prior history of the college brings strong evidence of anti-Deweyan philosophy and practice--the elitism, the concept of education as preparation for the leisured life, the controlling concern that it be approved by the wealthy community outside. One entertains the suspicion that this college was perhaps not even in intent Deweyan, and therefore not a valid subject for this study, since one of the criteria in the sampling process was that at each college Dewey's educational philosophy was considered a strong influence.

The influence of Dewey's educational philosophy. Relevant evidence was not abundant. The data showed that of those persons involved in the preliminary planning, only MacCracken directly avowed any adherence to Deweyan philosophy. (See page 152.) Neither Lawrence nor Coats, according to the data gathered, pledged any allegiance to Dewey or his ideas. Nor, it must be admitted, was any reference to Dewey found in the later records of Sarah Lawrence that were examined. To be sure, the progressive influence was undeniable. Everyone connected with Sarah Lawrence understood its destiny to be in large part the interpretation of progressivism at the college level. But there was little to suggest that Dewey was in any sense considered on campus the philosophic father of Sarah Lawrence.

Thus the justification for the inclusion of this college must, as at Bard, rest upon inferential grounds. For example, MacCracken's statements that Vassar shared Dewey's beliefs, followed quickly by many demonstrations of Vassar's progressive tendencies, seem to indicate that the concepts of Deweyism and of progressivism were considered to be interchangeable. Again, the grouping of the colleges of the sample

as four of a kind in the public eye, encourages a similar equivalency. Benezet, who had studied Sarah Lawrence around 1942, was later part of an evaluation team. At that time he mentioned in his section of the resulting report three parallel ventures in progressive education: Bard, Bennington and Goddard ("Evaluation Report," Note 12, p. 5). Since the study at hand presents evidence that two of these colleges considered Dewey's philosophy to be a powerful influence on their educational philosophies, and that the other drew its philosophy from one of these self-styled Dewey-oriented institutions, a circumstantial link may be established--Deweyan by association.

McDonough, in her extensive study of Sarah Lawrence, presented her conviction that Sarah Lawrence's education sharply contrasted with traditional concepts and reflected Dewey's influence.

> The pedagogical philosophy of Sarah Lawrence reflected the tenets of Deweyism. Dr. MacCracken, the chief policy maker of the school during its initial phase of development was himself a follower of John Dewey. . . . Individualistic personal exploration and student centered education for the purpose of enriching lives and society formed a foundation of the principles of both Dewey and Sarah Lawrence. (Note 2, Chapter II, pp. 1-2)

A continuing identification of Dewey with Sarah Lawrence was observable in Campus U.S.A. Boroff there allied progressivism with the philosophy of Dewey and others such as James and Whitehead. He labelled Sarah Lawrence as progressive (but guardedly so) and believed that it represented orthodox Deweyism (Boroff, 1961, pp. 160, 161).

For the purpose of this study, these inferential data will suffice. Practices and theory similar to those found at Sarah Lawrence were observable later at Bard and Goddard, and at the more contemporary

Bennington. There can be no doubt that Sarah Lawrence's experiences served to some extent as a model for other colleges in the sample. The conclusion was reached that to omit Sarah Lawrence from the sample would be more hazardous for this study than its inclusion on grounds less than perfect.

Sarah Lawrence and the Model

A major task facing President Warren was the clarification of the goals of the college, the need to rescue it from the effects of the sometimes contradictory statements issued by MacCracken, Coats and Lawrence. MacCracken quite obviously intended Sarah Lawrence to be the first college to implement the progressive doctrines wholeheartedly. Lawrence reflected his goals in his Letter to the Trustees.

> [The aims are:] First, with reference to the mental development of the individual, to graduate women in whom intellectual interest has been made so stimulated that it will continue as an animating principle throughout life; Second, with reference to the spiritual needs of the individual, to graduate women whose college training has made them appreciate the value of leisure and . . . the profitable use of . . . leisure; Third, with reference to the general contribution of the individual to her community, to graduate women . . . fruitful as leaders, or skillful in rendering intelligent support to . . . others; Fourth, with reference to the special contribution of gifted individuals, to give the student . . . opportunity to develop her talent and . . . to acquire [a] background in general culture. (Lawrence, Note 9, p. 5)

These multiple aims were echoed in the first catalog written under Coats' aegis, with the exception of the fourth item, which was deleted ("Aims and Offerings," 1927-28, p. 17). Later, in 1940 President Warren published A New Design for Women's Education, a primary source for data which establish her priorities for Sarah Lawrence. Her

opening paragraph concerned itself with the question of aims.

> Colleges throughout the country today are examining themselves and being examined as never before within our memory to find out what their real objectives are and how they are going about the business of attaining them. Regimentation in education is under fire. Colleges are making efforts . . . to get away from it. . . . The general aim is towards a more individualized education. . . . It so happens that two women's colleges were the first to break away from the educational pattern centered on subject matter to be learned and to substitute development of each person according to her needs and interests. (Warren, 1940, p. vii)

Clearly, Warren's focus was upon the individual; but a second central feature was also observable. She stated, "While the emphasis is on individualized education, we find a predominantly feminine overtone" (p. 6).

> Her college education has become, not the first step toward rejection of her traditional role as wife and mother; nor yet a final fling before settling down to it; but a rich and challenging prelude. (p. 142)

Reflective thinking. These excerpts assist little in the analysis of Sarah Lawrence's adherence to the aims set by the Model. One may certainly conclude that nowhere in the fundamental philosophy of the college was there expressed a dedication to the training in inquiry that weighed so heavily in Dewey's thinking. In accord with the structure of the Model, the role of science at Sarah Lawrence was investigated in order to ascertain if it might have been utilized at the college for the purpose of giving emphasis to the developing of reflective thought.

Sarah Lawrence and science. The first intimations of the allocation of a low status to science at Sarah Lawrence came in statements made by Coats and MacCracken in the catalog for the first year.

MacCracken wrote in a comparatively moderate tone:

> In natural science, the course will be descriptive and informational rather than experimental. (MacCracken, 1927-28, p. 8)

Coats took a more colorful stance with declarations bearing evidence of a decided anti-scientific bias. Indeed, she devoted three pages to a denial of the traditional role of science in higher education, charging it with serious defects:

> [Scholarship] involves careful analysis of data presented, the evaluation of a system of deductive and inductive reasoning which renders logic a tool of invariable reliability, and the regarding of causes and effects as constituting linear systems of absolute certainty. (Coats, 1927-28, p. 11)

This flawed notion of science, accepting the method of inquiry but ignoring (or ignorant of) the dialectical nature of science, led her to suggest alternatives to the scholarly pursuit of science, implying an abandonment of the methods of science as a common tool.

> Of late, certain facts have led us to hesitate, to question, not so much the worth of a university education as it is, but whether there are not other domains which could be . . . examined. . . . Numbers [of applicants], although worthy of "higher education," are not constitutionally fitted to become research workers. . . . Moreover, we are increasingly aware that rapid as our scientific advance has been, there are needs which it can never meet. (pp. 11-12)

Obviously convinced that the methods of science had little to offer the young women in her charge, she continued:

> We are in need of a new technique not of fact but of value. . . . Its basis will be <u>not the rational and precise thinking</u> characteristic of growth in science--but an establishment of the rules of validity in the realm of appreciation, of aesthetic judgment, of cultivated taste. . . . Especially must the modern American college retrace a bit and pick up a thread lost when scientific interest, by its very success in important directions, absorbed the attention of makers of the curriculum. (p. 13) [Underlining added.]

Although Miss Coats then paid a nominal tribute to the scientific and the rational as tools, she continued to present them in effect as foes of the "powers of appreciation" and of the "canons of good taste." This dualism can only be interpreted as a flat denial of Dewey's position on the general need to teach inquiry.

However, this study has chosen (as it evalutes the program at Sarah Lawrence) to by-pass Coats' early influence. The question then is the role granted to science and inquiry under the leadership of President Warren. Did she adopt the same attitude that Coats had shown? Or was science designated to make a significant contribution to the development of powers of thinking? Two important sources were consulted--Warren's 1936 report on the first ten years of the college, and her book, A New Design for Women's Education, mentioned above.

The former contained a brief section, two paragraphs in an 80 page report, devoted to a discussion of natural science. In this section, President Warren quoted MacCracken's treatment of the work in science as descriptive and informational rather than experimental and offered no philosophical modification (Warren, Note 5, pp. 22-23). Elsewhere in the report she commented that until 1934, at which time a science wing was built, the college was "very inadequately equipped with laboratory facilities for pure science and for psychology" (p. 7). The new wing enabled Sarah Lawrence "for the first time to develop adequate work in science." Prior to that time "we had slender offerings"

(p. 49).[12]

She paid even less tribute to science in her book, which was the public declaration of her educational philosophy. In fact, there was nowhere any mention of the sciences or of the importance of scientific method in the education of women. Thus it seems that neither in practice nor in theory did Warren counteract the bias introduced by Coats.

Further research revealed that the general attitude towards women and towards the individual contributed to the relegation of science to a minor role. For example, a college pamphlet printed in 1938, Finding Oneself, reported on a hypothetical freshman, Joan II. Joan had a "consuming passion to write."

> She discovers from her don that she is free to concentrate on what she wants most in life. She will not be sidetracked with required freshman courses in mathematics and science. ("Finding Oneself," Note 13, p. 4)

Another freshman, Joan I, with little notion of what she expects of college, was allowed to study science of a particular brand.

> What chemistry Joan has studied in boarding school seemed to her to bear little relation to her own life, but from something her brother's roommate said, she suspects there may be more to science. In biology she soon finds the relation. It begins not with a remote organism called an amoeba, but with the human body. . . . In the laboratory she learns to

---

[12]The results of testing done in 1932-33 and 1933-34 by the American Council on Education indicated that Sarah Lawrence students did poorly in science, although, if the science scores were deleted, they would have ranked 8'th out of 140 overall (Warren, Note 5, p. 49). In 1961, Sarah Lawrence women were reported to perform creditably on Graduate Record Examinations, except in the areas of mathematics and the sciences (Boroff, 1961, p. 165).

> respect evidence, to form and suspend judgment. The scientific method will prove an invaluable tool in other studies and in life. (p. 3)

One is forced to suggest that there is a fundamental inconsistency in two such concurrent utterances regarding science. It does not appear logical to consider science as a valuable tool while describing it as a sidetracking mechanism. Dewey's thought would be that the ability to inquire effectively would be an essential for any capable writer. It appears that the major working assumption was that the majority of women at Sarah Lawrence would marry, that education at Sarah Lwrence should be essentially concerned with the concommitant values of its students. Warren estimated that eight out of ten of the Sarah Lawrence population planned for marriage and a family (1940, p. 142). They share, she said, "the natural preoccupation of the modern young woman who, with few exceptions, looks forward to marriage."

> The constant desire is expressed in every area of the curriculum for more guidance, preparation and emphasis on family relationships and adjustments, on marriage, human biology, housing, woman's part in the economic world, on understanding oneself, children and other people. (pp. 6-7)

The resultant of this orientation, of the structuring of science studies to suit the matrimonial instincts of the young women, can be observed in later reports. Altschul, for many years a Chemistry professor at Sarah Lawrence, recalled:

> The task of making the sciences meaningful has always been of central importance to Sarah Lawrence. When I joined the faculty I became greatly involved in this challenge. While this does not imply that the challenge replaced my simple-minded scientist's dedication to the eminence of chemistry, it does mean that at Sarah Lawrence the need for new interpretations of science reveals itself with particular clarity and has always intrigued those of us who teach it. (Altschul, Note 14, p. 7)

Over the years, the data show, the basic treatment of science was, as in other subject matter areas, conditioned by the determination that subject matter be used, not as an end in itself, but as contributary to the student's development (Warren, 1935, p. 659). This interpretation of science can be seen throughout the entire first decade at the college, as the following excerpts illustrate.

The first catalog listed the offerings in science as Botany and Zoology, Chemistry and Physics, Mathematics, and Psychology--a total of four courses.

> Botany and Zoology: Foundation of acquaintance with evolution and with human physiology.
>
> Chemistry and Physics: Emphasis on applied science and concrete conditions. ("The Aims and Offerings," 1927-28, p. 21)

In 1930 the Physics and Chemistry course was lyrically described by a faculty member quite fittingly named Miss Joy.

> One by one the material things with which we are familiar are being revealed as bits of vibrating something-or-other. Vibrating in response to what? From the chiming bell whose trembling we can see to the antena [sic] coil in which hidden oscillations [sic] of unbelievable rapidity bring us clearly a voice from the antipodes, our environment is a sea of vibrant physical energy. . . . Are you interested to put your finger on this physical pulse of the world? to comprehend in small measure the urge of the engineer to know and guide? The physics-chemistry laboratory is the place to begin. (Doerschuk, Note 15)

Miss Joy disappeared from the record in 1931, and a Mrs. Keith rendered a somewhat more sedate account of the course.

> This course will be developed as an introductory course in either chemistry or physics, according to the preference of each student. The interrelated aspects of the two sciences will be covered by all students in the group. (Doerschuk, Note 16, p. 8)

> Emphasis will be placed upon the application of these sciences to the life of the individual. . . . First year: a survey of matter about us. Each student will choose for specialization work in one of the following groups (a) application to the arts, (b) application to the home, (c) economics of chemistry. (Doerschuk, Note 17, pp. 8-9)

It is pertinent to note that at this time, 1932, the Natural Sciences were still limited to single courses in Chemistry and Physics, Zoology, and Mathematics, whereas the number of courses in psychology had risen to five (p. 1).

Warren, in 1935, continued to describe Chemistry in a similar vein.

> The teacher of chemistry may be working with one group which is interested in the arts and for whom the approach to chemistry is through a study of glazes, pigments, and dyes. Another group may be interested in the part chemistry is playing in modern industrial life. (Warren, 1935, p. 659)

In 1938 the author of a fund-raising pamphlet wrote:

> Science, particularly human biology, plays an increasingly important part in the home and family program. Marked interest is shown in studies of growth, reproduction, evolution and heredity, and the close relation between biology and psychology. Every effort is made to satisfy this thirst for scientific knowledge of vital concern to women. ("A Statement," Note 11, p. 19)

Certainly Dewey would have no quarrel with the focusing of scientific studies around an interest of the students, though he might not agree with the intense individualization that seemed to be implied here. Moreover, he would, it is proposed, ask one crucial question. Was the emphasis in the teaching of science, whatever the focus, upon the process of inquiry? Whatever framework is chosen, the basic Deweyan reason for the study of scientific subject matter is the training of the student in the art of reflective thinking.

Obviously, Coats and Warren were little concerned with this aspect of science at Sarah Lawrence. There is, however, moderate evidence that the science faculty did attempt to encourage some attention to inquiry within the anti-scientific atmosphere of the college. Progress seemed to have been made slowly over the years.

In 1932, Mrs. Keith ventured to state that the laboratory approach would indeed emphasize the quantitative aspects of any problems undertaken (Doerschuk, Note 17, p. 8). The second year of the chemistry course, she continued, would as well give added attention to the theoretical side of chemistry, to form a "solid foundation upon which to build a scientific approach to any . . . later problems" (p. 9).

In the same year, zoologist Dr. Schrader for the first time expanded upon the Sarah Lawrence concept of science as necessarily fitted to individual needs and intended to form a basis for the interpretation of life (Doerschuk, Note 15). Now appeared the suggestion of "incidentally, some insight . . . into methods of modern research"; laboratory work concerned with the development of the experimental method (Doerschuk, Note 17, p. 9). By 1938, the progress was quite evident. The catalog for the 11'th year still introduced Natural Science as a means for understanding the environment, but not just as a collection of facts. Significantly, the method of thinking used in science was presented as "applicable to all thought" ("Natural Science," 1938-39, p. 24). Chemistry was still focused around the interests of the students; its first term was devoted in general to food and cooking; digestion and physiological chemistry; and drugs, hypnotics, and alcohol.

But upon this interest was built, at least in intent, a theoretical background for the wider interests of the second term. Laboratory work was used as a means for the solution of particular problems, not as an independent end (p. 29).

When Altschul then reviewed his long years at Sarah Lawrence, he included inquiry as an integral feature of science.

> I would like to stress just one point: while the results of science are important, to be sure, an appreciation of its methods and its motivating spirit seem to me to be as relevant. An understanding of the scientific attitude must be the central purpose in planning an undergraduate program, whatever its direction. (Altschul, Note 14, pp. 8-9)

This statement is, of course, in direct opposition to those earlier ones made by Coats. Apparently, at least in the sciences, there did occur a gradual growth of an attitude accepting the power of the scientific method in education. It was not given much attention by either Coats or Warren; it seems to have emanated from the science faculty itself and to have been tolerated but not supported.

Two conclusions can be supported. First, there was little concentration upon science of any kind at Sarah Lawrence during the first decade. A later proposal on the future of science on the Bronxville campus supports this statement.

> The study of science has been emphasized less here than study in certain other fields, and . . . a greater amount of original work has been done in the arts, the humanities and the social sciences than in science. ("The present," Note 18)

The second conclusion drawn is that Sarah Lawrence, beginning with a bias hostile to science, gradually developed in the sciences a more normal respect for the methods of inquiry. However, during most of the time under study, science was used as an interpreter of life, not as a

system of thinking to be incorporated into all aspects of education. The little science that was available to the Sarah Lawrence student did not generally focus, as did Dewey, upon the scientific process. Sarah Lawrence not only failed to meet the specifications of the Model in this respect, it actually denied its philosophical foundations.

The role of inquiry in other fields. Since even science instruction at Sarah Lawrence tended to minimize the teaching of inquiry, it was unlikely that other areas of the curriculum would evidence any significant concern with the application of scientific method. Such proved to be the case. The consistent attitude prevailed that subject matter was to be subjugated to the interests and needs of the individual, that an understanding of life was the primary goal, not the acquisition of the powers of reflective thought. Dewey, of course believed that efficiency in inquiry gave the student not only a better perception of his environment but also the means for its control

Reviewing the data, ample support can be found for the conclusion above. For example, Miss Coats in her Statutes for Instruction explained to prospective faculty the function of curriculum offerings:

> The aim for the great body of our students is not the sort of attainment represented by high academic ratings. It is rather so to stimulate their interest in things of the mind that a desire to learn will continue as an animating principle in their lives after they leave college. (Note 10, p. 4)

She paused momentarily to suggest that the student should develop ability to "weigh evidence and [would gain] a judicial spirit," but then returned again to the need to concentrate upon the "appreciative faculty" in the student.

Other documents, such as Coats' address (Coats, 1928), the catalog for the first year ("The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog," 1927-28) and Doerschuk's Statement (1933) were reviewed without locating the data sought. Programs of study were examined. Introductory Psychology in 1932 was reported to have an "emphasis on its applicability to art, music, literature and the drama, depending on the needs of the class" (Doerschuk, Note 17, p. 9). By the time President Warren examined the first decade at Sarah Lawrence, she had, however, adopted some of the vocabulary that Dewey used in discussing inquiry, particularly the stress on the need for a real problem.

> We are coming to think in terms of problems to be studied in all their aspects. (Note 5, p. 21)

> [There has been a] development of a social science department on broader lines than is usual. During the past four years particularly, the conventional departmental notions have been abandoned in favor of courses built around problems. (p. 23)

In 1938, training in the arts was presented as having a "single fundamental problem--that of helping the student to understand art in relation to herself," to help her "gain personal freedom and increase her capacity for enjoyment." However, an additional function was to develop the potential for "direct, resourceful and realistic thinking" ("The Arts," 1938-39, pp. 34-35). A later pamphlet sounded a similar note, delineating the need for a student to learn to investigate problems from a wide base.

> An inquiring mind, an attitude of tolerance towards ways and beliefs unlike one's own, the habit of reserving judgment until all the evidence is in, and of getting as much evidence as possible at first hand, are some other concrete objectives of a college education. ("A Statement," Note 11, pp. 5, 6)

Conclusions. Gradually, the emerging concern of the science faculty with the issue of inquiry found some faint parallel development in other areas. However, the ten years from 1928-1938 were essentially barren of a genuine concern with reflective thought in any area--science or non-science. There was no philosophical or practical agreement with the Model in respect to the role of inquiry in higher education at Sarah Lawrence.

Social aspects of education at Sarah Lawrence. In 1961, Boroff characterized Sarah Lawrence as the college for the "Bright, Bold, and Beautiful." Reporting that its girls were "extravagantly pretty," that its campus resembled "what it admires least: an ultraswank finishing school," he also labeled the college as progressive in many ways. In the area under consideration here, the social aspects of education, he drew his own definite conclusion about the philosophy of the college. At Sarah Lawrence, he said, they believed that education "should be staunchly concerned with the contemporary world--its realities, ideas, and issues--and should reach back to the past not for its own sake, but to understand the present" (Boroff, 1961, pp. 156-161). To be sure, the individual was still the center of the educational process, but the social aspect was there as well. To support his argument, he detailed experiences such as assisting in a nursery, conducting community surveys, field trips during vacations. However, he presented Sarah Lawrence's experiences in the thirties as an "interesting counterpoint" (p. 173). In 1927, he suggested, the emphasis was strictly upon the individual; "the social orientation came later with the dark

urgencies of the Depression" (p. 161).

By the mid-thirties, he wrote, the Age of Politics had arrived on campus. Social science and philosophy were the favored courses. A heightened social consciousness was in vogue.

> The culture heroine on campus was the daughter of an honest-to-goodness coal miner. . . . An alumna recalled that she was introduced to modern dance at a political rally on campus where grim-visaged girls danced The Silicosis Blues. (pp. 173-174)

Boroff, noting that the young women still dated mostly Yale and Princeton boys, proposed, as have others, that there was evidence of conflicting tendencies at the college.

> Sarah Lawrence approaches the individual student with an almost religious awe of her potentialities, yet it also socially minded and energetically activist. It is at once aristocratic and democratic, practical in its bent and high-flying visionary. The wife of the founder . . . can help to explain some of these contradictions. She has been described as "an old-fashioned progressive woman." (p. 161)

In contrast, Benezet, who had turned his attention to this same topic in 1943, reached conclusions in some respects contrary to those of Boroff. He did find that Sarah Lawrence, leaving behind what Boroff later called the theme of beauty, gradually began to evidence a growing concern with the social, at least in its stated aims. Benezet reviewed the published goals of the college from 1932 to 1941 and offered the excerpt below as evidence of an evolved social aim in 1940-41.

> The common aim is the development of social responsibility; a synthesis of work, recreation, social life; a sense of comparative values in the use of time. (Benezet, 1943/1971, p. 56)

However, Benezet concluded that, although courses in related areas were available, they were not required. The only consistent and fairly common social experience was the field work, which was "perhaps limited

and transient." There was no general mechanism to give a "strongly society-centered outlook" to education at Sarah Lawrence (p. 65).[13]

This study affirms Boroff's analysis in terms of the existence of contradictions in the philosophy of the college, but also concludes that Benezet was correct in suggesting that the focus upon the individual greatly outweighed the societal concerns. It is proposed that those conflicting aims of the college, the attempt "to train women for the responsibilities of [both] leisure and community" ("Education for Women as Women," Note 19, p. 61), created a tension that was resolved in favor of the individual. Again, it can be seen that the demography of the student body was in part responsible for making the task of socialization more difficult than at a less expensive institution with a more hetereogeneous population. Cogan, discussing the early concept of Sarah Lawrence as a finishing school, likened the education of the Sarah Lawrence woman to the process of "tearing off the insultation," an opening rather than a finishing process (Cogan, Note 20). This remark is illuminated by a return to an earlier comment in 1938.

> At Sarah Lawrence we were not long in finding that the simple processes of thinking and learning are impeded more often than not by ingrained prejudices, conventions and misconceptions typical of the immaturity of our freshmen and aggravated by their economic background. "Anyone can get work who really wants a job," "The Negroes were better off under slavery," are familiar, recurrent samples. Students' interpretations of what they see and read tend to be colored, if not obscured by

---

[13] Benezet's study was based on interviews with students, faculty and staff over a period of a year and a half, providing him with a sturdier base than that which Boroff had. Boroff seemed to have pulled much of his material from college literature and a brief visit to the campus.

> emotional reactions. Our first efforts, then, must be in the direction of freeing their minds from blindspots, opening their eyes to the real world in which they have led more or less protected, insulated lives. ("A Statement," Note 11, p. 6) [Underlining added.]

This de-insulation was done, it was claimed by various means, including the agency of "the larger environment surrounding the campus."

> Opportunities are created . . . to gain such experience in the studios, dramatics workshops, nursery school or science laboratories at the College, in field trips to housing developments, juvenile courts, clinics, markets and factories, and in part time regular jobs in nearby communities or in New York City. (p. 6)

Such generalities did not convince Benezet, as seen above, that the practices at Sarah Lawrence were adequate to fulfill its own educational goals. This study, which has the added advantage of a comparison with a more truly socially-oriented college, Goddard, found few specific examples of a general outreach to serve the larger community, to define social in a Deweyan sense.

MacDonough, for example, saw a Deweyan integration of school and community, although she gave only minimal data to support her contention. She recorded that in 1928-29, adults from the community were invited to attend a number of regular courses or even to request instruction for groups of their own forming. Apparently, there were only a few who availed themselves of this opportunity. Beyond that sole example, she cited only the usual--field trips and work in outside agencies (MacDonough, Note 2, Chapter III, p. 12).

Perhaps the college's strongest effort towards a true social orientation was the establishment of a nursery school on campus in 1937. However, it, like all of New York City, was to serve as a

laboratory for students interested in home making, and marriage, as much as (or more than) to be a service to the community ("Education for Women," Note 19, p. 6).[14] Thus it seems that the Sarah Lawrence education was little related to the community outside. It failed to institute practices intended to lead to the concern with the outer world which Dewey deemed an essential goal of education. There was, indeed, a practical isolation from the larger environment which later observers have recorded. A 1955 Middle States evaluation team charged:

> The attention of the faculty is so focused on their students and their obligations to them, their faith in the Sarah Lawrence plan of education and in the College itself is so complete that they seem to have comparatively little concern about what is happening on other campuses. ("Evaluation," Note 12, p. 5)

In a like note, Boroff spoke of the "February letdown" (p. 164), a topic to which a current faculty member also addressed himself. Woolfson (Note 21) attributed this slump, surprisingly enough, to the isolation of the campus--in the sense that the college, although less than an hour away from New York City, is surrounded by a suburban community. The proximity of the city did little, he said to lessen the sense of isolation felt by the students.

Lawrence had indeed hoped that the college would "both serve and be served" by the community (Lawrence, Note 9, p. 6). He also espoused the concept of self-government (p. 4). Doerschuk presented the

---

[14] In 1935 Warren wrote in similar fashion, emphasizing the uses made of the community outside in the education of the students. However, there were some associated social values inherent in those practices (Warren, 1935, p. 661). Taylor (1958, p. 5) described the founding of the Nursery School "as a laboratory in psychology and human relations."

view that the progressive college recognizes that "each person is fundamentally group formed, . . . an individual within a community."

> Community Government at Sarah Lawrence [is] based on a constitution in which both faculty and students are on an equivalent basis, with an elected central committee of each body, meeting together to consider matters of common concern. (Doerschuk, 1933, p. 5)

McDonough reported on the original form which the community government took, wherein offenders were tried in a facsimile of a formal court. This was abandoned when students, mostly Freshman, offered strong objections to it (McDonough, Note 2, Chapter III, p. 11). Such an arrangement does indeed seem inconsistent with the general tenets of progressive education and may well be attributed to Coats' early influence.

The overall impression of the little that was written about self-government at Sarah Lawrence in action is that it underwent frequent changes, that it varied in its contribution to the social education. Boroff wrote much later this evaluation of the system:

> The college community in many ways is faculty dominated. Students are counseled at every turn, they chair the meetings, and they make large pronouncements; but the very respect for large ideas that the college inculcates insures that the teachers will predominate. (Boroff, 1961, pp. 170-171)

In only one aspect was there congruence with the Model. In the classroom there was evidence of group work which was to provide an opportunity to learn the cooperative skills which Dewey felt necessary in a progressive democratic society. In the section below, "Scientific Teaching Methods," the actual operation of the classroom will be investigated further.

Conclusions. Only in the area of the classroom were Dewey's ideas for the social impact of education realized. Community government was not a strong or stable force, nor was there evident much involvement in the outside community. Such contacts as were made were largely for the enhancement of the education of the individual. Little adherence to the goal of the Model was detected in the early years at Sarah Lawrence.

Teaching methods. Warren, in her Ten Year Report, reviewed faculty interpretations of the guiding principles undergirding the methods of instruction at the college. Her conclusion was that there was a persistent preoccupation with the attitudes and interests of the students (Warren, Note 5, p. 20). Another publication of the college described a curriculum "in the liberal arts which would stimulate and develop the particular talents and interests of the students" ("A Brief History," Note 6, p. 1). The techniques used in the classroom were accordingly developed to further these goals. They were in all respects quite similar to those already outlined for Bennington.

Lawrence's Letter of Instructions to the Trustees spelled out what probably were MacCracken's viewpoints, stressing the tutorial plan, small classes and a minimum of instruction by use of the lecture (Lawrence, Note 9, p. 6). Coats followed with her plan for group work in seminars and discussions, carefully detailing instructions for the faculty. In the seminar, the faculty member was to be considered as a referee (actually so designated) who assisted the student leader, chosen by the group.

> The discussion should be free, and the referee should enter only in case it lags, or the student leader proves inadequate, or the trend becomes seriously at variance with the ideals and objective of the administration. A mild degree of opposition or even of invective should be accepted as signs of life and not necessarily to be repressed. The last ten or fifteen minutes of the period could well be spent in reviewing the work of the day. . . . The referee should be careful not to desire any particular solution, but to look for one which best expresses the opinion of the majority of the group. (Coats, Note 10, p. 9)

Warren generally approved of Coats' plan, although she dropped the referee nomenclature. She also described the independent work which was coordinated with the two hour weekly meetings of the group, supervised by way of a half-hour weekly individual conference with the instructor in a course. This individualizing resulted in different "contracts of work for each student in a class, all with reference to a central enterprise for the group" (Note 5, p. 28). An enthusiastic description of the operation of the group was written in 1938. (This also incidentally reinforces the idea that education at Sarah Lawrence was directed to an understanding of life.)

> The opening session of a course often turns into a round table discussion which shows the instructor what the students are thinking and what they want to find out. Their interest becomes the point of departure. Since they are more vitally interested in their own anatomy than in the amoeba, biology usually starts with the study of the human body. Psychology leads off with human relations as viewed in common family situations. Economics may plunge into a comparison of key industries in which the fathers of the students are engaged. ("A Statement," Note 11, p. 14)

This approach naturally resulted in a general rejection of the use of standard textbooks. Warren and others repeatedly made this point. At Sarah Lawrence, "exploration of the library facilities is substituted for textbooks" (Warren, 1935, p. 660). Warren restated

this idea in more picturesque terms:

> The trouble with most textbooks is that they take all the sport out of learning. Their authors have had all the excitement of the chase through fascinating sources and leave for the student only the dead quarry. Education without benefit of textbooks challenges the student's sporting instincts. (1940, p. 11)

Again in 1938, she explained:

> In a college where so much emphasis was placed on individual work text books played little part and students were from the first trained to look up their own material in the library. . . . The library at once became the focus of the college. (Note 5, pp. 11-12)

Kemp, in a study of the use of the library at Sarah Lawrence, recorded the finding that the per capita circulation for Freshman only at Sarah Lawrence was higher than the per capita circulation calculated for the total student body in conventional colleges (Kemp, Note 22, p. 50).

It can be seen that these techniques in the classroom relate generally to the practices which Dewey instituted in his Laboratory School, involving group activity and the assumption of some responsibility by the individual for the direction of his own education. Another strong element was heavy emphasis, also common to Dewey's thought, upon the integration of subject matter. Coats' had proclaimed that "each subject taught be treated primarily with a view to its correlations with other subjects" (Coats, Note 10, p. 4). For example, Joan Freshman (See page 170) finds that an interest in one area led her into related fields.

> [She] had spent a summer . . . near an Indian reservation, was absorbed in Indian life and arts. Exposed first to the arts, she found in the course of tracking down clues leading to allied fields, exactly what she was searching for in anthropology. Along with the study of primitive arts and cultures

> she took up archery as a pastime. Chemistry gave her the essential technique for analyzing glazes used in primitive pottery. Psychology inspired her to write a paper on the culture of the Hopi Indians. ("Finding Oneself," Note 13, pp. 7-8)

Warren expressed the same concept in a less dramatic fashion:

> The College is attempting to break down the water-tight compartments into which academic subject matter has been confined. Every effort is made to assist the student to correlate her work in different fields. For instance, a student of psychology may be studying the problems of marriage as illustrated in certain plays which she is reading for dramatic literature or in novels recommended in a course in the development of the novel; a student of creative writing may be analyzing musical forms for the light they throw on styles in writing; a student of physics may be analyzing problems of stage lighting in connection with her work in dramatics. (1935, p. 661)

Students from Bennington, observing classes at Sarah Lawrence as part of a conference there, reported that they saw little radical difference "in class conduct and composition" other than an "overabundance of Brooks sweaters, pearls, and red nail polish" (Clement, 1937, p. 93). However, the comment was offered that at Sarah Lawrence, "breadth rather than depth is the main objective. . . . On the whole, a lack of a sense of direction . . . impressed me as being a prominent feature of the college's educational system."

A curriculum feature which was to encourage the broadening of the subject matter was a variety of exploratory courses offered to Freshmen. An instructor duly described his introductory course in literature as "an introduction not only to literature but also to a new set of ideas--psychological, social, philosophical."

> He explains that they will probably take up Immortality as viewed by Plato and again by Fosdick. They will read Plato, but she can go and hear Dr. Fosdick. ("Finding Oneself," Note 13, p. 2)

Although Dewey couched his ideas in this area in less evangelical terms, there was a common thread. There were mutual goals. Dewey said: Thin the walls between areas of knowledge; allow for individual differences; encourage activity on the part of the learner. The use of up-to-date scientific knowledge was utilized by both. Warren believed that the basis for the teaching methods at the college was in fact "an honest endeavor to put into practice all that modern psychology can teach about the learning process" (1940, p. 5).

Conclusions. Thus there appear certain areas in which practices at Sarah Lawrence were in the spirit of the Model. Science had revealed that learning was a personal experience; therefore an emphasis upon the individual, her interests and needs, was made a matter of primary concern. The integration of subject matter was carried out with much enthusiasm and publicity. However, the fundamental base at Sarah Lawrence was in the individual herself, not in the primary goals of the Model. In consequence, although there was much coincidence between these practices at the college and those suggested by the Model, it is suggested that the motivation differed extensively. This issue will be discussed more fully in the concluding chapter of this study.

Structure. Lawrence (or was it really MacCracken?) instructed the Trustees to make the faculty entirely responsible for the formulation of educational policy at the college (Note 9, p. 2). Miss Coats accordingly, with consultation with MacCracken, set forth well-defined expectations. The model for her proposed curriculum was to be Vassar; the courses to be offered in the Junior College were to be equivalent,

she emphasized, in content and method to those usually found in the first two years of a conventional college (Coats, Note 10, p. 4).[15] The first catalog duely listed a traditional arrangement of offerings, consisting of four groups: the Arts, Natural Science, Foreign Languages and Social Studies. The requirements for graduation were: six courses from the four groups; three selected from one group to provide sequential study during the two years, one from each of the other three groups. In addition, two courses were to be selected from a fifth group. This was comprised of specifically designed seminars related to the chosen leisure activities, discussed above. For each activity, there was an associated required seminar ("The Aims and Offerings," 1927-28, pp. 17-19).

But with Warren's assumption of responsibility for the college, this structured atmosphere was modified. Warren (1935) and her faculty looked upon subject matter as a means to the fuller development of the student, not as an end in itself. Education became, not a "mass of material to be absorbed," but "abilities and capacities to be developed." Therefore, there were to be no required courses; rather "the College challenges the student to an understanding of the world in which she lives and the acceptance of a responsible role in it" (pp. 659-660).

The focus of courses became, as indicated above, the interests of the students. The college curriculum was no longer to be worked out

---

[15] One questions what had happened to MacCracken's expressed concern that the usual first two years of college were unsuitable for many young women looking forward to marriage.

by faculty "in terms of a curious conception of the collective academic mind, known as the 'logic of the subject matter' " (Warren, 1940, p. 9). Instead, a new attitude was defined:

> Good teaching down the ages had unconsciously or intentionally found the point of contact with the individual taught. But the snag which good teachers have usually struck in trying to carry on from the first point of contact has been the limitations of a rigid curriculum of certain required courses in a certain fixed order.
>
> One of the things which brings to Sarah Lawrence College the exceptional teachers who make up its faculty is the prospect of working out an individual philosophy of education to its logical conclusion through a flexible curriculum adapted to each student's own needs. ("A Statement," Note 11, pp. 4-5)

In accord with this principle, set requirements were replaced with a "careful advisory system" (Munroe, 1942, p. 36). During Warren's years in office, there was never a required course. The usual student selected three courses from the same four general areas, listed above. This selection might, it should be noted, include the practice and theory of art and music. In addition, there was an expectation that she would be involved in an "activity" which would represent a quarter of her work towards her diploma ("Sarah Lawrence College," 1938-39, p. 4). Field work and independent study were associated with the selected course work.

Under Coats, designing of the individual curriculum was done in consultation with the student's don and the Director of Education. However, the results were often unsatisfactory, so by 1936, a new arrangement had been devised. A week was set aside for the registration of Freshmen. During these days, she met in conference with a group of three instructors including her don, all of whom had perused her

admissions folder. Together this group scheduled further interviews with faculty who might be helpful (Warren, Note 5, p. 27). For the remaining years of her stay at Sarah Lawrence, she relied upon her weekly conferences with her don for further program planning, as well as help with time management and even with social problems (p. 29).

The theme above was consistent with related policies in another aspect of education at Sarah Lawrence--evaluation. Coats planned bi-annual reports to parents, using for grades only C for satisfactory work and D for incomplete endeavors. An outside Examining Board of faculty from Vassar or other near-by colleges set up written and oral examinations for students at the end of the year's work in each course (Warren, Note 5, p. 48). This plan was dropped after a three year trial. Warren reported a gradual evolution of the evaluating process over the first decade. She detailed the factors which faculty came to consider.

> To what degree a student is finding a sense of direction; how she functions in relation to other persons; what ability she shows to make use of contemporary resources, to draw on the experience of the past; whether she thinks actively, faces a situation directly, is developing humane attitudes,--these are illustrative of the kinds of considerations that underlie present attempts at evaluation.
>
> Instead of marking by grades teachers prepare an analysis of the student's work in terms of her development. (Notes, p. 30)

Apparently grades were not used as a control either of the student's motivation or of her curriculum. MacCracken provided another interesting comment on this matter in a later interview with Miss Warren.

> I think that you ought to put into this talk the fact that from the very beginning the organization you now have was well established. In the first place, no ranks in the faculty. . . . Second, no mid-year examinations--no examinations to speak of. Students are reported on psychologically, educationally, socially, but the rest we just leave to Providence, and every student has to be invited back. No student has a contract of graduation. . . . But she has to be invited back. ("Conversation," Note 1, p. 20). [Underlining added.]

Conclusions. Once again, as at Bennington, education at this sample college was found to be without formal structure other than that provided by the required weekly conference with a don. It was she or he who was responsible for the progress of the individual's studies. Balance and continuity, important elements in a Deweyan education, were thus dependent either on the student's own control or the quality of her don's guidance. That the advisory system met the goals of the college to supply a flexible individualized education is apparent. But the outcome may have often been, as Boroff proposed, "a lumpy compote," or "a cultural smorgasbord" (Boroff, 1961, p. 162). The expectations of the Model were clearly not met at Sarah Lawrence. Instead there is seen a movement from a moderate structure under Coats, to extensive flexibility introduced by Warren in the name of progressive education.

Specialization. In view of the conclusions drawn above, it would have been inconsistent had Sarah Lawrence required that a student major or specialize in a particular area, with the associated required number and sequence of courses. Even after the college became a four-year institution granting an A.B. degree in 1931, there was still no such formal specification. There was, however, some evidence that at least

concentration of a sort, not necessarily in the traditional mode, did occur and was intended or encouraged.

In 1933, Miss Doerschuk discussed this matter:

> Other purposes influencing the arrangement of a student's program are: that she shall have time and opportunity for the intensive pursuit of a subject--which becomes impossible if her program has too much variety, and if her schedule consists of too many stated appointments, and too few [un]broken periods of time for study. Also, that her program of work shall have for her some unity. . . . We aim, therefore, to achieve both integration and orientation, through joint planning of the work in detail among her teachers, or by direct responsibility for integration on the part of the adviser. (1933, p. 5)

> While almost every student does in fact have some work in all the major fields of study and does concentrate her effort in one area, there is no specified sequence of courses. The plan is that she shall take work in science when it fits into her own mental structure . . . , rather than when the curriculum calls for it. She will select her field of concentration when she herself is ready to do so instead of making up her mind officially at the end of her sophomore year. If she comes to college already intent on some special interest, she need not postpone its pursuit . . . , nor is she forced to allege a definite ambition which she does not feel after two years of general shopping around. (Munroe, 1942, p. 37)

Conclusions. A requirement for specialization, the natural outcome of a Deweyan concern with inquiry in education, with continuity and balance, was absent at Sarah Lawrence. Although its policy was consistent with the college's aims for individualized instruction, it was not in accord with the design of the Model.

The role of experimentation at Sarah Lawrence. From the beginning, Sarah Lawrence has prided itself upon being an experimental college and has been accepted as such by many observers. The unknown author of a short history of the college stated that the original plans called for an experimental curriculum in the liberal arts ("A Brief

History," Note 6, p. 1). Warren called the college an experiment in women's education which might well provide valid findings for the education of men (Warren, 1935, p. 663). A somewhat later statement extolled the "significant experiment in the field of higher education for modern women" ("A Statement," Note 11, p. 1). President Taylor wrote: "Sarah Lawrence is known as an experimental college. It has been called, and in particular ways is, a progressive college" (Taylor, 1958, p. 4).

However, even more common than the use of the term experimental was the constant reoccurrence of the word "research" used in connection with the college in speeches, articles, publications by or about the college. It began with Lawrence. In his Letter to the Trustees, presumably written in 1926, he devoted an entire section, Provision of Research, to his wish that a department of research be set up at Sarah Lawrence. Its function was to modernize education for women, who were no longer swept up in the craze for financial independence, nor any more just the "ornament of a man-made society." Woman's new role in society demanded better "instruments for her training" (Note 9, p. 6). Coats informed prospective faculty that Sarah Lawrence "will be primarily a research college" ("Statutes," Note 10, p. 2). Arrangement of work and requirements at the college were to be "what further research proves to be best" (p. 4),--certainly a fine Deweyan goal. Doerschuk emphasized too the necessity that a progressive college study its students continuously, especially attempting to understand all the different aspects of the personality of each (Doerschuk, 1933, pp. 4-5).

President Warren stressed the research function of the college:

> We were pioneering not as a junior college but as an institution which was examining old procedures and methods of college education in the light of educational philosophies, based upon recent findings in psychology. (Note 5, p. 47)

Surely there is a curious twist evidenced here. Many questions are immediately generated by this concept of education as research with the emphasis upon educational psychology. Was Dewey's philosophy one of those studied? Nowhere is there any suggestion that such was the case. (See "The influence of Dewey's philosophy" above.) Was this genuine educational research in the Deweyan sense, with evaluative procedures built into the educational practices? Warren's details on the research undertaken at the college will be examined below.

But the most remarkable query of all is this: How did a college which prided itself over the years on its research activities, who called its whole educational system a research effort, justify its early anti-scientific bias? (See "Sarah Lawrence and science" above.) How did it explain to students the stress on <u>applied</u> science, the determination that education should <u>not</u> be in the rational and experimental manner of science, but should emphasize the descriptive and the informational? How, too, did it inspire respect for a research orientation of the faculty while relegating the teaching of science to a minor role?

Adequate answers to these questions have not been found. One then concludes, that here exists another of the several contradictions observed at the college. It thought itself research oriented; it specifically denied a research or scientific approach in its curriculum

offerings.

One more question remains. What was the nature of the actual research at Sarah Lawrence? Warren's report summarized the research activities of the first decade.

According to her, a Faculty Research Committee was established the first year. Its function was to draw up a plan for the research program to be carried out. It established the basic goal: to test the outcomes in personality effected by a Sarah Lawrence education. It also worked several years on revisions of admissions and evaluation forms. The second year it examined faculty work loads. In September of 1935, the college obtained a grant from the General Education Board to begin more research which it had been unable to undertake earlier for financial reasons. It was to be a two-year study of college freshmen; the goal was "to discover and develop the potentialities of college freshmen" (Note 5, p. 50). There were other pockets of active reserach on campus--the work of Caroline Zachary and of Eric Fromm. Zachary was relating curriculum methods and materials to changes in emotional stability; Fromm was studying the attitudes of students towards authority (p. 52).

In general it is obvious that the focus was on studies of the relationship of personality and education. Warren herself concluded that research of this type, studies "carried on with all the care with which the skilled research psychologist works, are the necessary foundation upon which to build modern education" (p. 53). And in fact, this sort of research continued. Taylor recorded various grants under

which studies were done, work that resulted in seven publications.[16] He also described another study in process of the effects of Sarah Lawrence on the lives of its alumnae (Taylor, Note 23, Part A, p. 5). But a Middle States evaluating team responded with negative overtones to his report on this study:

> The study recently undertaken by the alumnae has assembled material which will undoubtedly be valuable as a source of findings re outcomes. . . . The fact that Sarah Lawrence--proud of its standing as an experimental college--should have waited twenty-six years to make such a general study is something to bear in mind for the future. ("Evaluation," Note 12, p. 4)

Here perhaps is the key to an answer to the Model's question: was the college designed as an experiment in education? Did it build-in evaluative procedures as part of its educational plan? As the Middle States team asked:

> Should not the College be making a continuous assessment of its offering--department by department, as well as in a team? Should it not keep a continuous record of its alumnae?

Conclusions. Dewey would have asked exactly these questions. In addition, he might well have questioned the largely psychological

---

[16] The Uses of Field Work in Teaching Economics, Jean Carol Trepp. Sarah Lawrence College. 1939; Literature for Individual Education, Esther Raushenbush. Columbia University Press. Sarah Lawrence College Publications, No. 1. 1942; Psychology for Individual Education, Lois B. Murphy, Eugene Lerner, Jane Judge, Madeleine Grant. Edited by Esther Raushenbush. Columbia University Press. Sarah Lawrence College Publications, No. 2. 1942; Teaching the Individual, Ruth Munroe. Columbia University Press. Sarah Lawrence College Publications, No. 3. 1942; Emotional Factors in Learning, Lois Barclay Murphy and Henry Ladd. Columbia University Press. Sarah Lawrence College Publications, No. 4. 1944; Field Work in College Education, Helen Merrell Lynd. Columbia University Press. Sarah Lawrence College Publications, No. 5. 1945; Essays in Teaching, thirteen essays by members of the Sarah Lawrence faculty. Edited by Harold Taylor. Harper Bros. 1950. (Taylor, Note 23, Part A, p. 4)

focus of the research that was done, research which neglected academic and scholarly achievements.[17] The fact that long periods elapsed (1930-1935) with no significant studies of the outcomes of education points also to a violation of Dewey's understanding of experimental education. As any new idea or method is tried, he believed, the means to test the outcomes are an integral part of the plan. At Sarah Lawrence that first decade, experimentation seemed to mean essentially only the introduction of a new idea in higher education, of techniques already tested out in the secondary schools. Warren directly made this point: "The College was . . . designed to carry the work of the progressive schools onto the college level" (Note 5, p. 19). In a Deweyan college, that would have been the beginning of a process of evaluation and change. But Warren assured MacCracken some thirty years after the founding of Sarah Lawrence that "there have been very few basic changes from the original plan you and Miss Coats worked out" (Note 1, p. 21).

An experimental college proud of its constancy over three decades must be considered less than experimental in the Deweyan sense. Without consistent evaluation of the college program or for that matter, even of individual programs, lacking a concern with the flux between yesterday and today, without the conscious shaping of tomorrow's education by evaluation of life in the classroom today, an educational philosophy must be designated as other than Deweyan. Sarah Lawrence

---

[17] A most appropriate comment has been made: "From the point of view of the faculty conducting the educational research, it is . . . unfortunate if the group is not sufficiently varied . . . to make the findings of widespread value and application" ("A Statement," Note 11, p. 33).

has been generally considered as an experiment in education, but in fact appeared to be, especially in its first decade, much less experimental than Bennington. But like that sister institution, it seemd to have served as a demonstration of progressive education in the college.

Summary and Conclusions

The first college to open with a dedication wholly to progressive education (although not the first to be so planned), Sarah Lawrence suffered from contradictory philosophies and practices during its first years. Lawrence set the stage with his vascillating concepts of women. After his death Coats launched the college with her strange mix of the "new" progressive ideals, an elitism either innate or acquired in deference to the wealthy sponsor of Sarah Lawrence and a strong remnant of an old-fashioned fondness for a firm structure underlying educational practice. When Warren replaced Miss Coats, she introduced a more consistent outlook upon the education of women. Warren constructed a dedicated display of progressivism, eliminating what little structure Coats had established. But of even greater concern to a Deweyan educator was her delivery of the college into the sphere of influence of the developing field of psychology.

Warren was aware that critical views of her guidance in this direction were likely. She addressed the question early in her book which described Sarah Lawrence education as the process of educating the individual.

> You . . . may interpret what I write as the abandonment of all that is valuable in systematic scholarship in favor of the therapeutic treatment of the individual (1940, p. ix).

This study has indeed drawn just that conclusion. Her further expositions only reinforced the judgement that the concern with the psychological aspects of education did displace the academic and the scholarly. From the perusal of her protestations of innocence to this charge there emerged a conviction that the individual was enthroned in the manner of Rousseau, who had directly advocated the abolition of traditional education. Warren, like Rousseau, envisioned the role of the college to be to develop the natural potential of the individual.

> Each student, we believe, has within herself the seeds of what she is capable of becoming. The purpose of her college education is to enable the student to develop these innate powers to their utmost and grow into a mature individual emotionally and intellectually capable of coming to terms with whatever life may have in store for her. (1940, pp. 3-4) [Underlining added.]

A 1955 evaluating team used, interestingly, a similar analogy.

> It seemed to the Middle States Committee as if so much devotion was given to the seedlings in the Sarah Lawrence nursery--each receiving the optimum care--that little time had been left to consider the forest, or even the lumber cut from its trees. ("Evaluation," Note 12, p. 4)

Munroe, who carried out psychological research on teaching the individual, furthered this notion of a romantic philosophy on campus as she discussed "meeting the needs of women students." She wrote, "We were reluctant to impose a direction upon her studies which might be more suited to our needs than to hers" (Munroe, 1942, p. 39). In a similar fashion, Warren once reported that researchers at the college insisted:

> Questions of educational values for which curriculum and teaching practice may develop are not those asked or answered abstractly or upon a priori bases. Value . . . appears to mean "value to students." (Note 5, p. 53)

Sarah Lawrence quite clearly intended not to direct but to nurture its students, to provide the elements for a complete unfolding, to create a "total life" experience upon campus ("Evaluation," Note 12, p. 22).

> If women are to achieve sufficient maturity and balance through their education to enable them to face life's perplexities without unnecessary distress, whatever emotional blocks may be interfering with their thinking processes must be recognized and removed. Sarah Lawrence College has been a pioneer in its recourse to the skilled services of modern psychiatry to obtain this objective. ("A Statement," Note 11, pp. 7-8)

Just this sort of preoccupation on campus led Boroff to observe in a mildly malicious comment that "only girls in analysis were permitted to maintain cars on campus" (Boroff, 1961, p. 167).

The criticism which this study offers is not based on an assumption that Dewey would object to the use of modern findings in psychology or psychiatry. He advocated a constant invigorating of education by the application of all the knowledge that science could provide how learning most efficiently occurs. But Sarah Lawrence put to work the practice of psychology in the service of a philosophy shaped in the romantic tradition, with the individual sacrosanct. Psychology, not science or its methods, was to provide her with the full life. Attainment of psychological freedom replaced the freedom Dewey wished to confer--the power to control one's life through the medium of reflective thinking. The actualization of the individual obliterated Dewey's dream for the perfecting of society. An intense focus upon the

separate ego substituted for the wide-angled glimpse that Dewey provided within his philosophy of the great potential of education. One may well call Sarah Lawrence progressive. But to label the college Deweyan would indeed be in violation of the process of reflective thought.

Reference Notes

1. Conversation between Miss Constance Warrn, President of Sarah Lawrence College 1929 to 1945, and Dr. Henry MacCracken, Chairman of the Sarah Lawrence College Board of Trustees 1926-1936. Taped in Pougkeepsie, New York, October 13, 1961.

2. McDonough, C. The founding of Sarah Lawrence: A case study of the contradictions in progressive education. Master of Arts Thesis, Sarah Lawrence. 1978.

3. Bower, B., & Brooks, A. Historically speaking. The Campus, May 4, 1953, p. 11.

4. Lawrence, D. Sarah Lawrence College. Early recollections. July 1958. Typewritten.

5. Warren, C. President's report for the first ten years of Sarah Lawrence College. 1926-1936. 1936. Mimeographed.

6. A brief history of Sarah Lawrence College. October 28, 1965. Typewritten.

7. Hamlin, W. Personal interview. July 8, 1980.

8. Tweed, H. Remarks by Harrison Tweed at the Sarah Lawrence dedication ceremony, January 6, 1961. Typewritten.

9. Lawrence, W. Letter of instruction. Notation--probably written in 1926. Typewritten.

10. Coats, M. Statutes of instruction. 1927. Mimeographed.

11. A statement covering the purpose, achievement, resources, plans and needs of a pioneer laboratory college for modern women, Sarah Lawrence College. 1926-1938. Fund-raising publication.

12. Evaluation report for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. January 23-26, 1955.

13. Finding oneself. New York: William E. Rudge's Sons, 1936. Pamphlet.

14. Altschul, R. In Sarah Lawrence education. No date. Pamphlet.

15. Doerschuk, B. Fields of study. 1930-1931. Mimeographed.

16. Doerschuk, B. Fields of study. 1931-1932. Mimeographed.

17. Doerschuk, B. Fields of study. 1932-1933. Mimeographed.

18. The present and future of science in the education of students at Sarah Lawrence College. From A proposal for the development of teaching and research in science at Sarah Lawrence College. April 16, 1967. Typewritten.

19. Education for women as women. New York: William E. Rudge's Sons, 1936. Pamphlet.

20. Cogan, E. Personal interview. November 11, 1979.

21. Woolfson, L. Personal communication. November 11, 1979.

22. Kemp, F. Freshman reading in a progressive college. Master of Science Thesis, Columbia University, June 1941.

23. Taylor, H. Self-evaluation report for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. January 4, 1955.

Reference List

The aims and offerings of Sarah Lawrence College. The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1927-1928, pp. 17-18.

The arts. The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1938-1939, pp. 34-35.

Benezet, L. General education in the progressive college. New York: Arno Press, 1971. (Originally published, 1943.)

Boroff, D. Campus, U.S.A. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.

Broun, H. It seems to me. The Campus, May 4, 1953, pp. 4-5. Reprinted from The World, December 16, 1926.

Clement, C. Students and progressive education. Bennington College Bulletin, November 1936-June 1937, pp. 92-94.

Coats, M. Statement. The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1927-1928, pp. 11-16.

Coats, M. The junior college in the East. (Address) In Proceedings of the 9th annual meeting, March 1'st - 3'rd, 1928; Boston: National Association of the Principals of Schools for Girls, 1928.

Doerschuk, B. Statement. Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, March 1933, pp. 109-115. Reprint, pp. 1-6.

Leisure time activities. Student Handbook. Sarah Lawrence College, 1930-1931, pp. 58-59.

MacCracken, H. Statement. The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1927-1928, pp. 5-8.

Munroe, R. Teaching the individual. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Natural science. The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1939-1939, pp. 24-25.

Sarah Lawrence College. The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1938-1939, pp. 3-6.

The Sarah Lawrence College Catalog, 1927-1928.

Taylor, H. Sarah Lawrence reconsidered. Sarah Lawrence Alumnae Magazine, February 1958, pp. 4-5.

Warren, C. The Sarah Lawrence College plan. School and Home, 1935, 16, pp. 659-663.

Warren, C. New design for women's education. New York: Frederick Stokes, 1940.

Yale Daily News. The insider's guide to the colleges. New York: Berkley, 1974.

CHAPTER VI

BARD COLLEGE

A visit to Bard today rewards the inquirer with the attractive vistas of green lawns and pleasant hillsides expected of a country college. The uncluttered campus features a library of half-Greek and half-Modern architecture; along the wide central mall leading to the library is Stone Row, a long line of old stone dormitories now being renovated. A modern Commons building draws one's attention. Students, both male and female, come and go in what appears to be a happy equilibrium.

But such was not the case in the beginning days of Bard. The flux of events in those early years (1934-1944) was complex, crisis-ridden, involving several interesting personalities, but above all centered around a desperate scrabble for funds to implement the vision of a new education for Bard students. The historical data point to two parallel endeavors: one to convert a conservative Episcopalian Seminary, St. Stephen's, into a progressive college for men; the other to find financial backing for the new college. It is suggested that the great expenditure of energy and emotion in the latter pursuit delayed and indeed shaped the educational process. The focus on financial concerns largely controlled educational policy.

A detailed investigation of the early financial history of the college supports this statement and is recorded in Appendix D. That

chapter also briefly describes St. Stephens Seminary, founded in the mid-nineteenth century, for many years directed by Warden Bell. Bell, under the pressure of increasing financial difficulties, conceived and implemented the idea of an affiliation with Columbia University. When he was replaced by Dean Tewksbury in 1933, other significant changes were effected. The conversion from a Seminary to a secular institution was accomplished along with a renaming of the college--it was now to be Bard College. Tewksbury also brought with him a plan for a different kind of education on campus (discussed below). However, as he worked to convert his ideal for Bard into reality, he found that the new education increased rather than alleviated the fiscal distress of the college. His disagreements with the Board of Trustees and particularly with President Butler, head of both Bard and Columbia, largely over budgetary matters, resulted in his resignation in 1937. Dean Mestre of the Bard faculty then assumed the helm.

Mestre struggled for about three years with very similar financial problems, but died suddenly without accomplishing any significant resolution of the financial situation. It was Tewksbury's friend and personal advisor, President Leigh of Bennington, who accepted a temporary appointment as Acting President of Bard and proposed a financial plan to stabilize Bard's precarious position, a plan that was acceptable to the Columbia Trustees. However, when Gray of the Bennington faculty picked up the reins as Leigh returned to the Bennington campus, he too was plagued by the familiar monetary troubles.

It is proposed that the net effect of this continuous concern with financial troubles so severe that the very existence of the

college was often in question was destructive of morale and diminished the academic program of the campus. Many of the changes initiated at Bard on academic grounds, it is also suggested, when viewed in the light of the data available, appear actually to be in the nature of responses to financial pressures. Yet in spite of the unending struggle to survive and the limitations thus imposed, a new education for men appeared in Annandale, and grew and slowly developed. Its history is an important segment of this study.

An Academic History of Bard

Progressive tendencies. In 1943 Benezet published the results of his study which included Bard College, then less than ten years old. Since his research was concerned with general education and the progressive college, it was incumbent upon him to establish that Bard could be defined as progressive. His conclusion was that it might indeed be inferred to be so classified, but that direct evidence was lacking (1943/1971, p. 116). This statement appears to be not quite accurate. Student and college publications of the time clearly indicate that Bardians considered their college to be one of the new progressive institutions.

The quotations below, taken from The Bardian, support this challenge.

> Both [Bennington and Bard] were progressive in their nature and emphasized consideration of the individual student and his needs. ("Bennington, Bard," Note 1, p. 1)--1936.

> Bennington College [is] similar to Bard in many respects and somewhat more experienced in progressive education as their program was conceived earlier. ("Committee," Note 2, p. 1)--1936

> [Dr. Tewksbury] was largely responsible for the formerly experimental policy of Bard College, which is now widely acclaimed as one of the few American progressive colleges. ("Dean Tewksbury Quits," Note 3, p. 1)--1937

Others connected with the college viewed it as progressive in nature. Publications over the years attest to this conviction. The Bulletin for 1935-36 directly stated its progressive aims.

> In line with a number of other colleges and schools which have accepted the fuller implications of the progressive movement in higher education, Bard College seeks to provide an appropriate environment for young men who desire to engage in a program of self-education. ("General Information," March 1936, p. 11)

Dr. Mestre, upon the occasion of Dean Tewksbury's formal resignation, wrote:

> It is our responsibility to build an even stronger and more progressive Bard on the firm foundation laid down during the four years of Dr. Tewksbury's deanship. (Mestre, Note 4, p. 1)

In 1940 Dean Gray remarked that "Bard College, a progressive residential college in the Columbia University system has entered its seventh year" (Gray, 1940, p. 3). Numerous references can be found, the essence of which is reflected in the following excerpt from the 1963 self-evaluation:

> Bard is most often grouped in people's thinking with what have been called the "progressive" or "experimental" colleges,--Bennington, Sarah Lawrence, Antioch, Reed, and Goddard (a recent addition to the group). . . . Unlike Goddard, [Bard] was a "charter member" from the beginning of the progressive coterie, having acquired this emphasis in the decade of the movement's initial powerful influence on college education (1925-1935). (Kline, Note 5, p. 7)

In consequence, the conclusion may be fairly drawn that Bard and its associates considered the College to be soundly progressive. The metamorphosis of the sternly Episcopalian Seminary into this liberal college for men began, some say, even before the advent of Dr. Tewksbury and his Educational Program for Bard College. President Kline described the progressive tendencies that developed under Warden Bell during the years of association with Columbia.

> A decade before Dr. Tewksbury in the 1930's instituted his now-widely famed "progressive" program, embodying the philosophies of John Dewey, President Bernard Iddings Bell was calling from Annandale for "something like the European concept of higher education, of comprehensive examinations, of large freedom in preparing for thos examinations; . . . demand that college students be regarded as responsible persons rather than as boys and girls; . . . that curricula shall be adapted to students . . . rather than that undergraduates shall be forced into conformity with fixed curricula; . . . and to lead students to face knowledge in more comprhensive [sic] ways . . . " (Note 5, p. 3)

An external evaluating team commented:

> Following an increasingly progressive trend, the College became affiliated with Columbia University in 1928. . . . Bard's individuality as an institution comes from . . . its experimental and progressive emphasis acquired durings its association (1928-1944) with Columbia University. ("Evaluation," Note 6, pp. 1, 2)

Warden Bell did institute several major educational changes, in hopes of revitalizing the Seminary by attracting brilliant students. He proposed a distinctive honors program for students of high intellectual ability, reminiscent of that at Reed College. Although his program was not a financial success, Bell did establish high academic standards. In fact, it has been reported that in 1929, seventeen percent of the Sophomore class was denied promotion on academic grounds (Magee,

Note 7, p. 113), a fact which doubtless affected the financial situation. Other features of Bell's reforms that seem to relate to progressive educational thought were, Magee noted, increased freedom of election, self-paced education, and an enlarged tutorial system (p. 115).

Therefore, it can be seen that when Bell was replaced by Tewksbury, by the time that Dr. Tewksbury presented his Program, the old Seminary had already begun to shed its traditional skin. The emergence of a new education for men on the Annandale campus was already underway.

John Dewey's influence. Just as Benezet examined the progressive bent of his sample colleges, this researcher had to validate the choice of Bard as a college that professed to be Deweyan. Aspects of Tewksbury's Program for Bard will be offered below as examples of Deweyan characteristics. However, Benezet commented that the "Blue Document," as the Program was called at Bard, avoided direct reference to progressive education, perhaps because Tewksbury preferred to consider his plan closer to the "great English universities" than to the new education in America (1943/1971, p. 116). Direct reference to Dewey and his philosophy was also absent in Tewksbury's document. (See "Bard's Program and the Bennington Plan" below.) A connection to Dewey's philosophy has, however, been presumed by others throughout the years. President Kline, in 1963, as already mentioned, characterized the Program as "an advanced progressive curriculum . . . based on the philosophies of John Dewey" (Note 5, p. 1). The Bulletin of 1955-56 described the Program as the embodiment of "many of the ideas of Alexander Meiklejohn,

William Kilpatrick, and John Dewey" ("History," 1955-56, p. 86). A student, in her Senior Project, pointed out that the origins of the concept of individualized education within a group, found in progressive education and at Bard, were in the thinking of Froebel and Dewey (Shwartzapel, Note 8, p. 61). And, of course, the indirect connections were numerous. Tewksbury was himself from Teachers College and Sarah Lawrence. That he and President Leigh of Bennington were close, at least professionally, has been pointed out above. (See Appendix D, footnote 10.) At Bennington, it was generally assumed that Bard was "consciously modeled after Bennington" (C.L.M., Note 9), Bennington, it has been shown, deemed itself a Deweyan college. Bard, then had through Bennington a philosophical tie with John Dewey.

Contact between the two colleges was frequent and, as it will be pointed out below, some features of the community government at Bard were modeled after Bennington, assisted by a joint conference between students from both institutions. The strongest link with Bennington lending support to the argument above, however, was Tewksbury's Educational Program for Bard College. Like Leigh's Plan, it set out to draw a blueprint for a completely new institution, progressive in nature if not in name, bringing the elements of modern education together on one campus, this time for men, as Bennington had done for women.

> In 1934 . . . Bard set out to develop a college which would apply some of the principles already accepted in theory by

> the educational world, but at no men's college carried out so fully in practice. (Gray, 1940-41, p. 3)[1]

Bard's program and the Bennington plan. There was very little new in the Blue Document.[2] If the Bennington Plan was correctly characterized by John Dewey as a combination of "a number of the best factors that are now scattered through different universities" without the introduction of "anything radical" (See Chapter IV, footnote 15), then the Program, coming years after the Bennington Plan and the creation of Sarah Lawrence, was even less original. Examination of Tewksbury's three basic principles generally illustrates this point.

> The proposed educational program for the College is based on three fundamental principles: (1) the student's approach to his college work should be made through the particular abilities, interests, and purposes which he has discovered and demonstrated during the years of his previous educational experience; (2) these motivating elements in the life of the individual should be the center around which he should proceed to build, under guidance, his own curriculum; and (3) his college education following the line of his own abilities and the lead of expanding interest and enlarging purpose should culminate in a broad cultural outlook marked by the power and will to continue self-education throughout his adult life. (Note 10, pp. 1-2)

A closer look at the details of the Program provides specific examples of the similarity of many of its elements to those proposed by Leigh in

---

[1] See Chapter VII, "Goddard College," p. 269, for Goddard's very similar claim. There seems to have been little exchange of ideas between Goddard and Bard over the years. Several of the members of the Goddard community even expressed to this interviewer the opinion that Bard was founded sometime after Goddard began.

[2] It was interesting to discover that Tewksbury's program became known at Bard as the "Blue Document." This writer was loaned an "ancient" copy of Leigh's Plan, its cover faded and brittle, but unmistakably blue.

his Plan.

Tewksbury promised admission to the remade College upon the basis of individual talent or promise.

> Evidence of talent or promise in at least one field of cultural achievement will hereafter be regarded as the primary qualification. . . . Less positive achievements in one or more fields will not be considered an insuperable bar to entrance, provided the ability or promise in a single field is clearly demonstrated. (p. 3)

Leigh, five years earlier, had declared:

> Briefly, Bennington says to girls in all types of schools: Have you serious interest and real promise in at least one of the fields of human achievement in which we offer instruction? (Note 11, p. 6)
>
> At Bennington, as elsewhere, students with uniformly good records will be welcomed. But a goodly proportion of students have unusual aptitudes in one field combined with what may be called temporary or permanent intellectual blind spots in others. . . . No one will be kept out merely because she has not succeeded in some one subject. (p. 7)

Curriculum organization at Bard was to assure both "depth of insight and penetration into a particular field" and a "broad cultural outlook" (p. 2): specialization with a liberal education. Early declaration of a major was mandated, with the expectation that the student would spend about one-half of his time each year in the pursuit of his specialty. However, he was also expected "during the first two years to explore the other four fields of culture" (pp. 4-5).

Leigh had also specified for each entering student a course called the Trial Major[3] which, it has been pointed out, soon came in practice to establish an early major. He emphasized many times both

---

[3]Bard, during Gray's tenure, actually adopted the Trial Major nomenclature (Benezet, p. 123).

specialization and exploration.

> Rather than a two-year period of required distribution of work followed by a severely concentrated effort in the last years it is the plan of Bennington to encourage a broadening of interests and outlook along with the pursuit of a specialty so that both liberal outlook and specialization will be continued after graduation as a matter of choice. (p. 12)

Tewksbury discussed the system of individualized curriculum in the following terms:

> Under such a program the student is definitely expected to assume the major responsibility for his own education. This shift in responsibility lies at the heart of the new program. It is believed that an individualized curriculum . . . will avoid . . . the dangers inherent in the prevailing system of "uniform requirements" and "free election." (p. 5) [Underlining added.]

The Bennington Plan had ventured similar thoughts, in very similar words:

> A uniform first two years of work required of all these students would do violence to the immediate educational needs of a large proportion of them. . . . Work for this period will be individually arranged by deliberate conference between college officers and each student. This should not be taken to mean an unrestricted elective system. (p. 9) [Underlining added.]

Community life at Bard was to be part of the education of the Whole Man. All activity on campus was to be recognized as "an integral part of the educational program" (p. 12). Leigh had already written:

> The athletic, dramatic, musical, publication, self-government, and religious enterprises of undergraduate life, by intelligent guidance at the outset, can be incorporated into the main intellectual and artistic program sponsored by the faculty. (p. 13)

Other aspects of the Program could be described, features which find their counterpart in the Bennington Plan: the guidance system, the use of the seminar in place of the lecture, the abandonment of grades and credits as evaluative devices, the integration of course content,

the inclusion of the fine arts in the college curriculum. One might, perhaps quite rightly, argue that Tewksbury's suggestions for Bard were rooted simply in the broad principles of progressive education, rather than accept the presumption that Tewksbury relied upon the Bennington Plan as an important source for his own design. However, a knowledge of the close ties between Tewksbury and Leigh, and the recognition of the similarities between the Program and the Plan, support a conclusion that Bard was deliberately designed as a "Bennington for Boys."

Educational policy--1937-1944. Little educational change took place in the years from Mestre's appointment to 1944, when Bard and Columbia dissolved their ambivalent alliance. The energies of Dean Mestre, his faculty, and students were absorbed in the struggle to survive. As it has been shown, financial rather than academic issues dominated the campus. President Leigh's tenure was as well largely dedicated to securing a long-term plan for Bard, a period of relative security which would improve its chances for a future. Leigh's report to the Trustees on January 9, 1940 was largely fiscal in nature (Note 12). But when, on December 19, 1939 the Trustees did discuss what appeared to be issues raised by Leigh in his preliminary analysis of the College, one educational issue was "possible changes in curricula, after consultation between Dr. Leigh and the new Dean" ("Report of the Board, Note 13). In the absence of Leigh's "Final Report," educational change recommended by Leigh can only be inferred from the actions of Dr. Gray during his early years at Bard.

It was evident that most of the Four Year Plan which was finally adopted as a result of Leigh's persuasive report was directed toward financial problems. Gray reported the progress made in similar terms: increased student enrollment, purchase of new equipment, renovation of antiquated buildings (Gray, 1940, pp. 3-4).

However, Gray also reported at the same time some changes in educational procedures, designed to strengthen Bard's emphasis upon individual teaching and guidance (pp. 5-6). In this respect, Benezet credited Gray (who was probably putting into effect Leigh's recommendations) with the introduction of the Trial Major which "proceeds much as at the college where it originated [Bennington]" (p. 123). This course in the major area was an individual tutorial and the content was defined by teacher and student. Benezet also remarked that the course sampling method which had "crept into Bard" was ousted. Greater reliance was placed upon student selection of courses outside of the major, assisted by the student's advisor (p. 124).

The following spring, Dean Gray addressed the Trustees with comments reflecting upon the effects of the Four Year Plan upon the academic atmosphere at Bard.

> I have already reported orally on the new spirit among the students and faculty. In the middle of the first semester a quickened pace in the work of the College was noticeable and has continued. . . . One of the oder members of the faculty once said to me that it was significant that in all the eighty years of the College's existence no faculty member had ever built or bought a home near theCollege. It may be significant of the new spirit of confidence and security that about half a dozen teachers are now seriously hunting for sites and talking with builders. ("Gray," Note 14)

By February of 1944, when the faculty assigned itself the task of re-evaluating the basic concepts of the Bard Educational Program, they adopted a five point statement of principles. (See Appendix B2.) It confirmed the dedication to individualized curriculum built upon the student's interests and abilities, the dual aims of specialization and a broad education. It approved continued use of the four year major and its central focus upon it in the student's academic career. The recommendation was made for continued use of the Trial Major and the tutorial-advisory system. The only area of change, not a major one, was a shift towards a better integration between fields of study. The teachers of the major subjects were charged with increased responsibility for the broadening of their students' education, with integrating specialization and general education. New curricula in broad areas of study were mandated ("Minutes of Special Meetings," Note 15, p. 57).

None of these actions was a significant departure from Tewksbury's first proposals. Benezet suggested that Gray's changes seemed "to fit closely to the working aims of Dr. Tewksbury's original plan" (p. 125). In fact, in 1952, President Case dramatically opened a symposium called to discuss student complaints with these words:

> The most discouraging discovery I [have] made . . . was that the Bard Plan, proposed and adopted almost twenty years ago, is still intact today. No plan is that good, and even if it were, it couldn't keep that long without spoiling. (Case, Note 16, p. 2)

Therefore, the assumption that the Tewksbury Program (closely related to Leigh's Bennington Plan) defined Bard's academic role throughout the years with which this study is concerned seems to be justified.

Examination of the Model and its relationship to theory and practice at Bard will clarify the impact of Deweyan philosophy upon the institution.

Bard as a Deweyan College--Comparison with the Model

Bard's identification with progressive education has been examined earlier, as well as its direct and indirect ties to Dewey in a very general sense. Bard did present itself as one of a small group of colleges which had built their educational systems upon Deweyan philosophy and the tenets of progressive education. Yet, as was the case with other colleges in this sample, Bard did not differentiate between Deweyan and progressive theories or practices. In actuality, the published accounts of the aims of the college, from the times of Tewksbury to Gray and even beyond, were remarkably lacking in philosophical foundations. The emphasis at Bard was focused on a broad liberal education, not in itself at odds with Dewey's philosophy, but presented without the theoretical underpinings upon which Dewey based his own educational philosophy. Dewey drew a sharp distinction between a "liberal education" and one which "liberates." No group of studies is of itself liberating, he insisted.

> To define liberal as that which liberates is to bring the problem of liberal education and of the liberal arts college within the domain of an inquiry in which the issue is settled by search for what is actually accomplished. The test and justification of claims put forth is found in observable consequences, not in a priori dogma, (Dewey, 1946, p. 83)

He pointed out that the classical definition of liberal arts studies had historical roots antecedent to the scientific revolution, arising

during a time when liberal arts were contrasted with useful arts, when such a separation served to make a desired social class distinction. He stressed the need to reformulate education in terms of current social needs, and especially to establish the proper perspective on scientific and technological subjects. He concluded:

> The problem of securing to the liberal arts college its due function in democratic society is that of seeing to it that the technical subjects which are now socially necessary acquire a humane direction. (pp. 86-87) [Underlined in the text.]

Note that Dewey did not argue the value of including scientific subjects. He assumed their incorporation in a modern education. His concern was that they be taught in a "liberating" fashion, with an acknowledgement of their humane roots.

> The present function of the liberal arts college, in my belief, is to use the resources put at our disposal alike by humane literature, by science, by subjects that have a vocational bearing, so as to secure ability to appraise the needs and issues of the world in which we live. Such an education would be liberating. (p. 87)

Bard's more classical definition of liberal education can be inferred from the examples below: Tewksbury's original document proposed a "distinctive college" with a different approach--working through the student's interests, guiding the student to a self-designed curriculum, leading toward a "broad cultural outlook" which would, in the end, encourage life-long habits of self-education (Note 10, pp. 1-2).

> It will aim to be an educational force in the lives of its students in the most comprehensive sense of the term, adding to the acquisition of information, self-development and self-discipline, to intellectual achievement, moral enlightenment and religious insight, to scholarly attainments, judgement of

> values and powers of aesthetic appreciation, to equipment for living, quality of life. (p. 15)

The student newspaper printed a summary of Tewksbury's Program with the headlines: "TRUSTEES APPROVE BARD COLLEGE PROGRAM: Individual Responsibility is Basis of Revised Curriculum: Student Will Plan Own Program in 'Task of Self Education': Personalized Teaching and Learning to be Featured" (Note 17, p. 1).

Much later, President Kline wrote of the Tewksbury years:

> The college continued to heighten its already firm reputation for good solid academic work,[4] and in addition began to build up a widespread new reputation for a dynamic and stimulating intellectual life, with heavy emphasis on high student motivation and individual creativity. (Note 5, p. 1)

Dean Gray set out in 1940 to "clarify the principles underlining this venture in education" (Gray, 1940, p. 3). He stressed that the function of education at Bard was "to catch up the young man's curiosity and keep it alive as the driving force in all his education," as the means of "creating individual responsibility for the direction" of learning (pp. 5-6). No mention was made of a concern with the teaching of scientific method, of instilling the habits of reflective thinking, or even of incorporating in Deweyan sense, scientific subjects as "liberalizing" influences.

Examination of statements adopted in 1944 by faculty (See Appendix B2) and in 1951 (see Appendix B3) confirms the observation above (Liftig, Note 18, 1970); there was little explicit dedication to

---

[4] A Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa was established at Bard in 1928. Bard was also, when Tewksbury arrived, accredited as a Class A college by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in the Middle States and Maryland, and by the Association of American Universities (Magee, Note 7, pp. 120-121).

the aims of the Deweyan College of the Model in the stated aims of Bard College. Yet many of the activities at Bard did represent practices with a decided Deweyan cast. Analysis of the educational practices in relationship to the model was then necessitated.

Reflective thinking. Even if the educational leaders of Bard failed to elaborate the aims of the College in terms of the importance of developing the power to inquire, it might yet be possible that they did indeed establish practices to incorporate this feature into the educational program. The Model suggests that the manner in which science studies were handled might indicate the extent to which reflective thinking was actually taught on campus.

Science at Bard College. The data on this topic lends itself to division into two discussions: the approach to science taken at Bard and the emphasis upon science as seen in student statistics and faculty comments.

Dean Tewksbury, in his Program, outlined the teaching of science with, it is interesting to note, an emphasis, not upon inquiry, but upon the social aspects of science.

> The student with a genuine interest in the phenomena and laws of the physical universe will naturally choose the field of the physical sciences and progressively extend his study into other parts of the realm of knowledge. The approach to the teaching of those sciences will be such as to give due recognition to the humanistic aspects of the subject. A definite effort will be made to correlate the content of the course in each science with that of other fields. . . . The effort will be to create an influence against narrow specialization and in favor of the integration of knowledge. (Note 10, p. 8)

At Bennington, as has been shown above, the science faculty interpreted their responsibility in science in many creative ways,

placing a strong emphasis upon scientific method. Bard faculty, too, stressed scientific method in its science offerings, but the variety and flexibility seen at its sister college were missing.

The Bulletin for 1940-41 drew attention to the Division of Natural Sciences and its expectations of students and faculty. The primary objective, it stated, was to train the student in the use of scientific method, described, as Dewey had done, as gathering data, organizing them, constructing hypotheses, predicting and testing the validity of the predictions, verifying or modifying the hypotheses. In addition, a very Deweyan emphasis upon the need in inquiry of a problem vital to the student was observable.

> Facility in the use of scientific method is more effectively developed by solving problems than by "passing" courses. For this reason a freshman who wishes to become a science major is asked what scientific problem he wants to investigate. If his interest is general rather than specific, the members of the science faculty discuss various problems with him and help him to choose one which will test his interests and abilities. ("The Division of Natural Sciences," 1940, p. 8)

This problem and subsequent ones would then occupy about one-fourth of the student's time and would be pursued through the Trial Major Conference. As s/he progressed in seeking the solution of problems, the needs for background and supplementary knowledge would emerge and thereby help to structure the individual curriculum. By the Senior year the science student would be ready to attack a major problem, sometimes on the research level, usually a topic "cutting across the conventional subdivisions of the field and emphasizing the fundamental unity of all science" (p. 11).

Yet it is difficult to ascertain from the data available the

extent to which theory was translated into practice at Bard. The Bulletin of 1935-36 listed extremely traditional offerings in science. For example Chemistry courses were the usual: General Chemistry, Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis, Organic and Physical Chemistry, as well as Biochemistry. In addition, there were Advanced Seminars and Tutorials ("Fields of Study," 1936, pp. 29-31). It would therefore appear that if the Deweyan philosophy of the division were in fact implemented, it had to have been done through the informal integration of courses and a non-traditional handling of the classical subject matter so traditionally organized. But nowhere did there appear during the years under investigation the unusual offerings seen at Bennington --no Chemistry of Pigments for artists or Human Anatomy for Dancers. Much of the evidence indicated a real attrition in the science area.

Whatever the calibre of science at Bard, it was not well-received by the students under the new educational system. Benezet had described the St. Stephens' program as a traditional offering of "classical and scientific studies" (p. 109). Magee reported that Warden Bell, during his later years, had actually increased the emphasis upon the natural and social sciences (Note 7, p. 115). The Bulletin of 1935-36 published data indicating that at that time while there were still St. Stephen's students on campus, 36% of the student body was enrolled as science majors ("Members of the Student Body," 1936, pp. 52-47). The next years saw drops to 32% ("Summary of Enrollment," 1936, p. 2); then 28% in 1938-39 ("Summary," 1939, p. 56). By 1941, the percentage was down to 20% ("Summary," 1941, p. 19). Dr. Rosenthal estimated the science population in 1979 at about 15% (Note 19).

A study of alumni occupations from 1948-1968 (p. 31) showed a distribution of rather less than 15% of science alumni in the returns received from the stratified random sample (287 returns out of a sample of 601). This same study showed as well that the science alumni were the only group which rated their major as poor in any significant numbers (Liftig, Note 18, p. 42). A student study of the Spring Term of 1953 showed a similar tendency. Out of 191 non-science majors, a total of only 31 science courses were taken; out of an average number of 4.28 courses per student, only 0.63 were in science. (Art was 0.98; Social Studies, 1.41; Language and Literature 1.27.) (Shwartzapel, Note 8, p. 70). The conclusion was drawn that the science Division attracted few students. It was even suggested that students entered Bard with "the idea of avoiding all science courses " (p. 71). This presents a sharp contrast to Warden Bell's St. Stephen's.

The 1963 evaluating team offered continuing criticism of the science program. Its low enrollment was attributed to limited offerings in one-man departments and a "lack of emphasis on the sciences by the college community" ("Evaluation," Note 6, p. 9).

Conclusions. It would appear, then, that Tewksbury's plan diminished, rather than enhanced, the emphasis upon science and most probably upon scientific method at Bard. Overall, the conclusions seems to be justified that science at Bard was not given the emphasis that the Model suggests, that it was not used as an effective tool, at least for the non-science majors, for the development of the habit of refelctive thinking.

Inquiry in non-science areas. Science, it has been shown, was

not used as a generally effective route for teaching reflective thinking. Were there perhaps other aspects of education at Bard that in practice did provide the student with the opportunity to develop the skill of scientific thinking? Or, on the other hand, was this cornerstone of Dewey's educational philosophy only an incidental and occasional consequence of the new education at Bard?

When Tewksbury's discussion of science in his original Program was examined, it was found that his emphasis was upon the humanistic values of science, rather than upon its natural connection with inquiry. It is not surprising, then, that when he wrote about the humanties, he again stressed this same approach.

> The study of the classical humanities affords a means of intellectual discipline and an instrument of liberal education. . . . [It] can be made to serve again as a means of liberating the individual for life in the contemporary world. (Note 10, p. 8)

Philosophy and religion students "will be led to acquaint themselves progressively with the character of the world they seek to interpret," to understand the "larger world of human achievement and culture, which is the ultimate goal of a liberal education" (p. 9). Similarly, social studies and art were to serve in the cultural enrichment of the student, in the broadening of his understanding of the world.

Clearly, in Tewksbury's view progressive education was largely liberal education. His Program was thoroughly pervaded by his concern for a broad cultural education (coupled, as discussed below, with specialization). He seemed either unaware of or indifferent to Dewey's strong argument for the need of an emphasis upon inquiry in <u>all</u> fields.

The faculty at Bard in general reflected Tewksbury's concerns,

if statements in the Bulletins are any indication. (It is assumed that faculty from each division had at least some input into the descriptions of the work of their division. At least, the catalogs' literature must reflect the aspirations, if not the actual practices, of the faculty.) The 1935-36 Bulletin made a general statement: "Students are encouraged to look upon the various fields of study as avenues of approach to the broader field of human culture" ("The Fields of Study," 1936, p. 27). Later, during Gray's tenure, literature, for example, was to be "an introduction to the ideas, manners, and ideals of the civilized world" ("The Division of Languages and Literature," 1940, p. 20), and "the study and practice of the arts together form the center of a liberal education" ("The Division of Fine Arts, Music, and Drama," 1940, p. 23). Careful perusal of these and other catalogs revealed only one area other than science in which importance was explicitly attached to inquiry--Social Studies.

> The study of the life of man in society includes all the materials which, in the traditional type of college organization, belong to the separate fields of anthropology, sociology, history, government, economics, statistics, psychology, and religion. By virtue of an emphasis upon problems and methods rather than upon these traditionally articulated fields of study, the division can offer to its students an opportunity for a comprehensive and at the same time rigorous investigation of human social behavior in both its historical and contemporary aspects. . . . [There is] a responsibility to stimulate the student's curiosity and to protect the spirit of inquiry. ("The Division of Social Studies," 1940-1941, pp. 13-14) [Underlining added.]

Here is apparent an emphasis upon integration of course work, (a vital concern of Dewey), and upon learning by inquiry. One might infer Leigh's influence at work here, recalling that he was a Social Scientist who initiated the Bennington Survey. At Bennington, the

Social Studies division was also the only division outside of Science that directly espoused the cause of inquiry. (See Chapter IV, page 127.)

Other practices were reviewed, in search of a mechanism by which non-science majors were introduced to scientific method. Might not the Field and Reading Period serve as a suitable instrument, it was asked? A student review of the second year of the Plan listed an interesting array of activities: a study of primate behavior on Borro by two students and a faculty member; work at a State Mental Hospital; studies of the chemistry of zinc, of violin construction, of liturgical music; visits to courts and prisons; and many others. According to the writer, one-third of the Bard students were involved during this Period in research projects, another third in reading at home, while the remainder continued their studies on campus ("Survey of Work," Note 20, pp. 1, 4). However, the role of the Field Period in guiding students, into habits of reflective thinking must depend in large part, it would seem, upon the quality of planning and of faculty supervision. Otherwise, its success in educating in inquiry must have been variable and occasional.

By 1939, students were less enthusiastic about this feature of the Plan. The Bardian reported that, for example, one student "put firecrackers in flour barrels and called the result an abstract movie." It presented two conclusions drawn from a random interview of forty Bardians.

> (1) For the most part everyone was agreed that the Reading Period was an invaluable part of the Educational Program, and

(2) that at present it fails in about 50% of the cases. ("Reading Period Over," Note 21, p. 1)

A number of students confessed that they felt inadequate to "carry on a project and derive very much more than a padded report full of glowing adjectives." It would seem, from this account, that the Period succeeded for those for whom it succeeded. It did not, however, offer a general avenue toward skill in inquiry.

Senior Projects were introduced in the academic year of 1937-38. These were to be interdepartmental projects, investigations or studies and were to replace the current system of examinations. All students were required to undertake this endeavor, which was expected to occupy one-fourth of the student's senior year ("Senior Projects," Note 22, p. 1). The administration considered the Project as an opportunity to show that he/she had developed the power to do significant work in the chosen major field ("The Senior Project," 1940, p. 7). Again, although some might well have been conducted with due regard for scientific method, there was no unifying principle to guide student and faculty toward this end.

Conclusions. The general approach to areas of study outside of the Science Division, with the possible exception of the Social Studies, was essentially directed to the broad goals of a liberal education defined in the classical sense, without the philosophical foundations of a concern with reflective thought. Those who avoided science, as many did (there being no required courses at Bard), may or may not have encountered scientific method as a tool in the course of their studies. Science majors were denied, as all others, the experience of

a general application of the method of inquiry in other areas, leaving them liable to the assumption that the use of inquiry was limited to the solution of scientific problems, rather than extending the conception of reflective thought as the preferred approach in the larger arena which Dewey envisioned.

The Model applies inquiry in all educational endeavors. Bard's emphasis was upon the cultural aspects of education. It generally neglected inquiry outside of science and social studies. It failed to meet the expectations of the Model.

Social concerns in a Bardian education. There can be no doubt that Dean Tewksbury had a modicum of concern with the social aspects of the new education he proposed for Bard. However, this concern turned upon the general dedication to a liberal education which would prepare the student to live in the democratic society, rather than to prepare him to improve the progressive democracy. As pointed out above, the aim of the new education was to gain an "understanding of the larger world of achievement and culture" (Note 10, p. 9); to provide the "equipment for living, quality of life" (p. 15). Much later, at the Bard symposium, called by President Case to discuss complaints made by the student body about the state of education at Bard (See page 219), Dean Esther Raushenbush of Sarah Lawrence, an invited participant, remarked:

> The reason I am interested in Bard and in my own college is that I think we have really tried in a very important way to get at the problem of what it means for groups of people to live, think and work together in a period of their lives so important that we can not overestimate it. (Raushenbush, Note 23, p. 5)

One example of a related feature, illustrating group learning in action, was, of course, the seminar system, designed to promote both individual and group work.[5] Tewksbury envisioned the seminar as "companionship in learning" (Note 10, p. 5). The students, he explained, would come to the teacher:

> They should find him in an environment of his own, surrounded by his books, his illustrative materials, his laboratory appliances, and the atmosphere appropriate to the subjects into which they are to inquire together. (pp. 5-6)

In this setting, the young men of Bard were to strive together toward their educational goals. The Deweyan implications of this element of the Plan are obvious. Dewey did indeed believe that education carried out in a group setting was the most effective arrangement.

However, the seminar at Bard received, over the years, a considerable amount of written criticism. One might fairly assume that there was even more which never found its way into print. At the Bard Symposium, again, another participant, Fred Hechinger, Education Editor for the New York Herald-Tribune, commented that as a replacement for the "dull and unproductive lecture system," the seminar was a "wonderful thing." Yet the complaints of the students and of President Case led to the conclusion that "the seminar now is just an excuse for not doing any hard work. . . . only a bull session" (Hechinger, Note 24,

---

[5]It appears that the siminar almost completely displaced the traditional lecture system. At the end of the second year of the Program, the Bulletin discussed the seminar using the words "course" and "seminar" interchangeably. "The normal expectation is that the student will participate in no more than four courses at any one period. . . . The student's participation in his regular courses will consist typically of a two-hour group seminar each week, prepared for by eight hours of independent reading and laboratory work." ("Individual Program of Study," 1936, p. 20)

p. 7). A student in a 1953 Senior Project made similar observations. Seminars, an integral part of the Bard education, averaging about eight students, should, she felt, give the student the opportunity to learn from the group discussion. However, certain failures were noted:

> I believe that seminars at Bard do not reach the heights which they could and should. . . . I would venture to say that in many cases the students do not take seriously the responsibility involved in seminar preparation; they are interested in what they can receive from the siminar rather than what they can offer. [See "Goddard," p. 283.] (Schwarzapel, Note 8, p. 73) [Underlining added.]

President Kline presented a more sharply defined description of the seminar in 1963.

> One of the chief justifications of the seminar system is that it forces students to state and defend their convictions, not in an isolated way, but to a community of scholars. . . . The instructor ceases to be a demigod . . . and becomes in a very real sense, a fellow seeker after truth. . . . He is, however, a person to be respected for his knowledge, which is superior to that of the students. . . . It should be clear that the seminar is only partially a democratic ideal. (Kline, Note 5, p. 8) [Underlining added.]

These comments, although taken from outside of the first decade of Bard's history, do serve to present the social expectations of the seminar, and to point out its limitations. It is doubtful that the experience in the first ten years was without similar flaws in operation. One might also suspect that the other colleges in the sample may have sustained similar doubts. However, in intent the seminar system was consistent with Dewey's concept of education within a social framework--a "conjoint" activity.

The classroom was, of course, the smallest unit of the college community, which Tewksbury intended to be "a miniature community with a life of its own," serving as a preparation for the larger life after

college (Note 10, p. 12). Community government was therefore naturally an essential feature of life on campus. Tewksbury, however, made no mention of this element of community life in his Program, even under the heading of Community Life, contenting himself there was a discussion of the role of extra-curricular activities at Bard.[6] It appears that the existing governance structure at St. Stephen's was left in place, to be rearranged later by students themselves. This decision may have been affected by the just-completed adoption in May of 1934 of a revised constitution, one which, in its extensive changes, sought to abolish fraternity politics and give a more representative government ("New Constitution," Note 25, p. 1). Little stress was placed on this phase of campus life in official publications; for example, the Bulletin for 1935-36 made no reference at all to student government. Even in the July 1940 Bulletin there appeared under the title Community Government only a brief paragraph.

> The community life is that of a free, democratic society of adults. The standards of conduct are those demanded of members of such a society. In the enforcement of the standards, the officers of the college and students work together. Instead of authoritarian boarding school regulation, the government is that of laws based on the understanding and consent of the governed. The problems of social life afford an unparalleled opportunity for education in citizenship and the educational approach is emphasized throughout. ("Community Government," 1940, p. 19)

Nothing was said, however, about the actual mechanics of such self-government. The Bardian proved more interested in the governing process than did the administration. It reported the activities of The

---

[6] He, like Leigh before him, recognized these activities as an integral part of the educational program. He proposed "to make room for the side shows within the main tent" (Note 10, p. 12).

Forum, a student group established in 1935 as a means for the exchange of student opinion. In the spring of 1936, The Forum sent representatives to Bennington to compare with students there the programs followed by that progressive college and Bard ("Bard to Attend Conference," Note 26, p. 1). Later, Bennington in turn sent delegates from its Student Educational Policies Committee to Bard ("Forum Reports," Note 27, p. 1). In January of 1937, two other educational conferences were attended by Bard students. One was held at Sarah Lawrence, with Bennington, Bard and Black Mountain all represented. The second brought together students from Bennington and Bard at New College ("Bard," Note 26, p. 2). The outcome of these activities was the formation of a Student Educational Policies Committee to work with administration and faculty.

In 1940, Dean Gray summarized the students' progress in this area. He recalled the amendments to the Constitution, the establishment of a Community Council intended to design a unified community on campus, and the advent of the Student Educational Policies Committee, which would review the educational program. He also commented upon the vigor of The Forum in promoting healthy discussion (p. 5). Thus it appears that by the end of Gray's tenure, the students at Bard had adopted a form of self-government clearly modeled upon Bennington's system. Unlike at Bennington, where Leigh seemed to have directed student action toward his pre-determined goal, the students at Bard initiated their own program of reform. The close ties between the two colleges acted, however, to shape community government there into the form already developed at Bennington. As at Bennington, the

arrangement can be seen as a practice quite in accord with Dewey's philosophy. But again, one must observe that the emphasis upon group activities and organization in the classroom, and upon group governance on campus alone does not satisfy Dewey's insistence that the student be made aware of his responsibilities to the larger society beyond the campus. To satisfy the requirements of the Model, evidence must be found to indicate that the society, not the individual, was an end of education.

Little such evidence was forthcoming. Benezet tactfully had concluded from his study in 1943 that at best, one might credit Bard with "society-oriented" aims, in contrast to their individual-centered and life-centered aims which he detected. For example, the Field Period, he said, had the potential for bringing the students into closer relationships with the real world, but he presented no evidence that such was the general case. Even the Student Government had inherent limitations, he noted, due to the restricted range of economic groups represented, a consequence of the high tuition (Benezet, 1943/71, pp. 130-132). (See Appendix D, p. 386.)

The data collected for this study supported Benezet's conclusions. One report was unearthed detailing plans for a regional survey of the communities around Bard, similar in many respects to the Bennington Survey ("Aspects of Plan," Note 28, p. 1). No further record of this undertaking was evident. Dean Gray did report upon an opinion poll conducted by members of the Economics Division using accepted research techniques (Note 29). But in general examples of practical involvement of Bardians with the larger society were not available.

President Case even chided his generation of students rather harshly.

> You are all the right things in the wrong places. You are wondrously flexible in will power and in commitments where you ought to be steady, as I think your conduct of the Community Service Program illustrates. . . . You are unsparing of selfishness and lack of imagination in others, but tolerant, forgiving, and essentially unconcerned when the annual student drive to support local and international causes of your own choosing nets just 80 cents a student. Eighty cents--is this the measure of Bard's concern for the whole world beyond this campus? (Case, Note 16, p. 8)

Conclusions. President Butler of Columbia, the strong advocate of Bard during its first years, once issued a statement to The Bardian. In part it said:

> Bard College has the advantage of an isolated location, so that it may live its own life without being merged in or submerged by the life of a great surrounding population. ("Butler," Note 30, p. 2)

His contemporary and colleague at Columbia, John Dewey, would certainly have taken issue with this separatist point of view. Even Dean Tewksbury presented a somewhat more Deweyan outlook.

> The student in college should not be isolated in an artificial world of his own apart from the realities of contemporary life. He should be given opportunities to get in touch with the serious activities of adults in the world outside the campus. (Note 10, p. 14)

To further such ends, the Field Period was offered, as well as the Senior Project and the seminar system, all later described by President Kline as techniques for encouraging a sense of social responsibility (Kline, Note 5, p. 8). However, all of these methods were in their practice severely limited. Bard's success in involving its youth in the life outside the campus was not remarkable. Its concern was primarily with the individual and his growth, with the development of an

interest in and ability for self-education beyond the college years. A fundamental working concern with society in the broad sense used by Dewey was absent.

On a smaller scale, certain practices at Bard were unquestionably suitable applications of Dewey's philosophy, although not actually based upon his theory of education. The integration of subject matter, discussed above in the context of science, was a Deweyan concept. However, Dewey wanted the focus of such integration to be the society, the gathering of knowledge and skills needed to understand the culture in order to make constructive changes. Bardian educational theory posited integration and understanding in order to improve the quality of life for the individual.

In short, the theory and practice at Bard was not in a real sense consistent with the stipulations of the Model.

Scientific teaching methods. Bard joined the progressive stream of thought by individualizing its instruction. This was accomplished, it was claimed, by the cooperation of both student and teacher.

> [The students] are urged to use their own initiative in the choice of experiments, reading, investigations, and artistic productions. This individual work is discussed in the conferences. A student is not merely a passive listener in a class, nor a mere reciter of lessons. He is urged to take his education into his own hands, to follow up his own questionings, and to go as fast and as far as he can. ("Individualizing the Courses," 1940, p. 6)

In this paragraph can be identified many of the aspects of teaching methods incorporated into the Model--activity versus passivity, the acceptance of responsibility for one's own education rather than a

subjection to external controls. Here too the focus upon individual interests is specified; in fact, the admissions policy had from the first stressed a special interest or ability as a criterion for acceptance. Unfortunately, most of the available data on this topic were in the form of pronouncements from administration. Unavailable (in contrast to the situation at Bennington and Goddard) were the richly detailed comments from faculty and students providing homely examples of life in the classroom, of creative applications of progressive or Deweyan theory. This lack may well be attributed to the ever-existing financial crises, occupying the time and attention of all Bardians, limiting the natural attention paid in a new college to the educational policies. Certainly, the bulk of the data collected dealt with fiscal rather than academic matters.

Conclusions. Yet, in as far as the data allow, the conclusion is reached that the teaching methods espoused by Dewey were in general use at Bard. The reservation is proffered that these same practices were in fact more a duplication of current progressive tendencies than a genuine consequence of an emphasis upon Dewey's philosophy.

Structure in curriculum. Freedom, in some educational systems, has often been equated with an absence of structure. The progressive colleges characterized by a scarcity of regulation have predictably been associated with great freedom for their students, a conception alternately encouraged and denied by the schools themselves. Shwartzapel, in her Senior Project, summarizing the situation at Bard in non-academic areas, wrote:

> Freedom exists on the Bard Campus in areas other than the academic. There are no house-mothers . . . , alcoholic beverages can be kept on Campus and are served at college functions, there are open houses on weekends. . . . In other words, there is an absence of the social restrictions normally found in the traditional out-of-town college. This freedom granted to the Bard student body is based on the assumption that Bardians are able to accept the responsibility which goes hand in hand with freedom. (Note 8, p. 74)

President Case had, in his frank and critical speech to students in 1952, reviewed another aspect of freedom at Bard.

> What, then is the significance of the kind of program to which we have been--and, I assume, are--committed? I should say that its significance lies almost entirely in where and how we start: with the special interests of the individual rather than with a particular arrangement and sequence of courses to cover fixed areas of knowledge. (Case, Note 16, pp. 9-10)

Both of these aspects of freedom have their roots in Tewksbury's Program. The underlying assumption there was that the young men of Bard were capable of self-education and self-regulation. The general theory for education was that the student, working with his advisor, would choose a major field and around that major build his curriculum for four years. This field was to occupy about one-half of his time. Changes in major were possible, but "for cause and not from caprice" (Note 10, p. 4).

During the first two years, the student, in addition to working in his specialty, was to explore other areas of culture by taking general introductory courses. The last two years were to be used to broaden the student's experience and enrich his intellectual experience. It is important to note that there was not, until President Case introduced The Common Course, a single required course at Bard. Students were to build their own curricula to provide specialization and

exploration, the ultimate goals of a Bardian liberal education. Evaluation of the extent to which an individual student met this responsibility was to be accomplished by the "intermediate challenge" (later called the Moderation) at the end of two years; and the "final demonstration," which in 1938 became the requirement that the student undertake and complete a Senior Project ("Senior Projects," Note 22, p. 1).

Although those associated with Bard were generally enthusiastic about the increased flexibility brought about by the adoption of the Program, warnings were issued regularly against the assumption that freedom was absolute on campus.

> You are free . . . to make plans for your education, but once a plan has been worked out you are not free to decide whether or not you shall do the work that is involved in following it. . . . You . . . have to do all the pleasant and unpleasant tasks that are necessary for achieving the thing that you yourself have wanted to do. (Raushenbush, Note 23, p. 8)

> The student is given considerable freedom to build his course of study around his own interests as long as he produces richly in this area. (Kline, Note 5, p. 2)

> The student can do almost anything, but we insist that he/she gain mastery of the appropriate tools. (Rosenthal, Note 19)

Conclusions. Structure at Bard was far removed from that proposed in the Model. Rather than a structured curriculum designed to develop in the student habits of inquiry and social responsibility, Bard abdicated the task of curriculum building, of the maintenance of balance and continuity, to the student without implementing adequate controls. Such control as existed was in the hands of the counselor, encouraging unpredictable results. For example, an external evaluating team once complained:

> The committee sampled student records, which showed the usual diversity in undergraduate programs of study. However, there were instances of serious gaps and one-sidedness. For example, one senior student who was admitted with only two years of secondary school mathematics and one year of biology had carried no courses in mathematics, science, economics, or government. A very little history, literature, painting, and music, plus one course in philosophy constituted the breadth. This student's record through three years was largely in psychology, including principles of psycho-therapy and sociology of courtship! . . . . This single example is cited only to raise the question whether moderation of itself sufficiently insures an adequate collegiate experience. ("Evaluation," Note 6, p. 8)

It is clear that emphasis upon the individual and his needs and interests overshadowed the ends of a Deweyan education. The thoughtful structuring of curriculum, the careful sequencing of study with the fundamental goals of education as guides, were not generally evident at Bard.

Specialization. Dean Tewksbury strongly espoused the concept of specialization. His theory was that the entering student should immediately select a major and focus his studies around it for four years. He expressed this idea, already in effect at Bennington, with the help of an analogy which, Benezet noted, became "mildly famous" (p. 119). In this "tree" analogy, Tewksbury claimed:

> The development of the mind of the student would be analogous to the growth of a tree which roots itself thoroughly in some particular plot of ground, develops in time a trunk of stable and living proportions, and finally reaches out through its branches thowards [sic] the fulfillment of its life purpose. Such an analogy stands in contrast to the usual conception of a college curriculum as a pyramid which covers a wide area at its base nad narrows to a point at its apex. . . . The College proposes to offer each student an opportunity to follow a thorough program of concentration adapted to his individual abilities which will lead, if wisely directed, to the ultimate attainment

> of the goal of a liberal education, namely, a vital appreciation and understanding of the broad field of human achievement and culture. (Note 10, p. 3)

Frequent repetitions of this analogy were found. It appeared in almost identical form, for example, in a paper in School and Home (Tewksbury, 1935, p. 652), as well as in the Bulletin for 1935-36 ("Underlying Principles," 1936, pp. 17-18). Gray's later report to the Trustees in 1941 further defined Bard's assumptions as to the function of specialization.

> Productive curiosity is not merely an aimless and scattered general curiosity but the kind that specialists in certain fields of knowledge have. Boys with hobbies have this kind of drive, and so do the masters in any field or work. All that our insistence upon the choice of a major field means is that we want to stimulate in our students the desire to find that work which engages their energy and even passion. Unless such discovery is made, we cannot promise them that their work will result in real education. (Gray, 1940, p. 7)

In 1944, Gray addressed a special faculty meeting, called to reconsider the "basic aspects of the Bard educational programi" In response, the faculty adopted a statement which reaffirmed the trial major and the primary emphasis upon the student's major in his/her educational program ("Minutes," Note 15, p. 57). (See Appendix B2.) Again in 1951, the stress was upon the development of ability in a major field (Liftig, Note 18, p. 5). (See Appendix B3.)

Although the general and consistent attitude towards the concept of the four-year major was a favorable one, there did arise an occasional dissenting voice. Dean Raushenbush of Sarah Lawrence offered the comment that perhaps Bard was emphasizing the major too much and too early, and as a consequence narrowing the range of studies

(Raushenbush, Note 23, p. 3). This contrasts sharply with Tewksbury's "tree" concept, wherein the major studies were to form the firm trunk from which all areas of culture should flower. Another criticism, this time by a faculty member, was quoted in the Middle States evaluation in 1963 and was directed to the evaluation of the individual's major program.

> In the absence of [comprehensive testing at the end of the senior year], an outside observer is forced to conclude that standards for the Bard degree must inevitably vary too widely, since programs of study, and the Junior Conference and Senior Project admit of wide diversity. To quote one faculty member; "Beyond advising and moderation, the major is not prescribed." ("Evaluation," Note 6, p. 8)

Conclusions. Early specialization was an enduring policy at Bard, from Tewksbury to the present time. Tewksbury's "tree" still grows on the Bard campus, is still a central landmark of the educational landscape. In the Model, specialization was also given prominence, for reasons growing out of the emphasis upon inquiry and social needs. But at Bard, specialization was a tool for liberal education, narrowly defined in non-Deweyan terms:

> Having gained proficiency in one kind of intellectual work, the student will have found the base from which explorations can be made into unfamiliar and less congenial fields for the purpose of "liberal" education. ("Liberal Education and Specialization," 1940, p. 4)

The contrast of a Deweyan specialization with the Bardian form will be discussed in the conclusions of this chapter.

Experimentation at Bard. A careful study of Tewksbury's Program fosters an interesting conclusion. Although faculty and administration often interpreted his plan to be experimental in nature, it is apparent

that Tewksbury himself considered that he was offering a new program of education which would, if followed, place Bard on a "sound . . . educational basis for the future" (Note 10, p. 1). No where does one find in his document any sense that he meant his program to be experimental; everywhere one encounters recurring "will-be's."[7] Yet for many years, the word "experimental" has been used almost automatically in connection with Bard, without justification or explanation.

President Butler, for example, in 1937 called the "educational experiment at Bard College" a definite success ("Trustees," Note 29, p. 22). He told The Bardian in 1939 that he considered Bard "a most hopeful and forward-facing experiment" ("Butler Sees Bard," Note 30, p. 1). Students seemed to expect an experimental atmosphere, and felt free to complain when this expectation was not met. A cryptic phrase appeared in the midst of an otherwise non-committal article in The Bardian on Tewksbury's resignation. Tewksbury, it was reported, "was largely responsible for the formerly experimental policy of Bard College" ("Dean Tewksbury," Note 3, p. 1). Another student wrote a letter to the editor in 1938.

> I came to this college with fairly definite ideas of what I wanted; but as I try to fit my idea into the larger plan of the group purpose, I find that it is lost. I suppose that in the early stages of the St. Stephens-Bard reorganization, there was a certain feeling of worthiness and awareness of purpose. There is often displayed, within a group setting

---

[7] One also notes in passing that this impression of an authoritarian attitude is reinforced by his use of such expressions as "it is imperative that the acting administration advance a general plan for reorganization," and by recalling his later encounters with the Trustees relating to his proposed budget, when he questioned the "wisdom" of the Trustees' decision.

> out for something new or adventurous, a mutual respect for their common goal. . . . As yet, I haven't discovered any clear-cut formulation or any elaborations of the Bard ideal. (Dunham, Note 31, p. 2)

In answer, the editor recalled:

> The demolition of the spirit of the Bard program [during the financial crises] has continued until it is open to Mr. Dunham's criticism. Discussion of the reasons for the program, so prevalent in the years before last . . . has died away until we are now "patting ourselves on the back" quite meaninglessly. (D.S., Note 32, p. 2)

And indeed, President Case, at the Bard Sumposium in 1952, accused the students of being the most reactionary group on campus (Case, Note 16, p. 3).

Dean Gray, credited with continuing the pioneering work of Bard "in the field of experimental education" ("History," 1955, p. 86) was unique in offering an actual definition of what was meant by the experimental program at Bard.

> We have all accepted realistically the need to create here a program of education which will distinguish us from other small colleges. Such a task requires a faculty that is scholarly and in earnest about teaching, but at the same time adventurous and imaginative. . . . We have a job to do. . . . As we define the job we also adopt procedures by which it is to be done. The procedures, however, are the experimental and therefore the changeable aspects. (Gray, 1940, p. 6)

Gray too seemed to consider the Program itself a fixed formula, with flexibility residing in the implementations designed by the College. In fact, the educational changes which he proposed during his years at Bard (1940-1946) were minimal. It was President Case who first proposed substantial change; who pointed out the inflexibility of Bard's program since Tewksbury first instituted it. He proposed at the Bard Symposium a startling innovation for Bard--a required course, the

Common Course for all freshmen.

> It has seemed to me . . . that Bard would be an interesting place to experiment with the common course to see whether, in an already unified campus, it might not provide [a] common intellectual interest. (Case, Note 16, p. 14)

Apparently President Case did not succeed in bringing an experimental temper to the campus. The 1963 Middle States evaluation commented:

> A good many of the procedures in the Bard program, introduced in the hey-day of the experimental institution, have, it would appear, now become almost sanctified. ("Evaluation," Note 6, p. 10)

This plaint brings to mind Dewey's warning against an attachment to outdated goals. It suggests as well a static rather than an experimental cast to education at Bard.

Conclusions. The Model presents the Deweyan College as active in continuously reformulating the educational experience of its students. Using data from current practices, it shapes the future from the past. But at Bard, often given the title of an experimental college, the program presented by Tewksbury controlled its policy for many years. The lack of experimental activities may be attributed to the financial exigencies mentioned above, although President Case chided his faculty for "using our perennial financial situation" as a scapegoat. He feared that the real difficulty lay in "a partial atrophy of imagination and the spirit of bold and well-conceived experiment" (Case, Note 16, pp. 5-6). The experimental Bard was, it seems in retrospect, largely a convenient nomenclature, quite likely derived as a substitute for "progressive." (See page 210 for Kline's casual use of the two words.) Like Bennington, Bard was designed to bring the theory of the progressives to higher education--for the first time on a campus

reserved for men. As such, it was not in harmony with the experimental College of the Model.

Summary and Conclusions

Although often described as an experimental college, Bard was in actuality an attempt to provide a "Bennington for Boys" on the campus of the traditional St. Stephen's College. The Tewksbury Program relied heavily upon Leigh's Plan for Bennington College. There is evidence that the two administrators conferred on academic matters during the Tewksbury years at Bard, Leigh acting as an advisor. Later, Leigh came to trouble-shoot at Bard after Dean Mestre's sudden death; Leigh's colleague, Dr. Gray (at one time Acting President at Bennington) became Bard's fourth Dean. Productive communication between students of the two colleges was recorded.

Thus the Tewksbury Program--a redistillation of Leigh's Plan, was instituted in 1934. It effectively controlled policy at Bard for many years. Even in the successions from Tewksbury to Mestre, Leigh to Gray, little academic change was observable. This lack of experimental activity has been largely attributed above to the constant financial distress in which the Bard community dwelt. In part, it has also been related to the authoritarian attitudes of Dean Tewksbury, to the lack of strong and persuasive leaders. There was also another contributing factor that can, with a little patience, be tracked down to an element in the prevailing practice and philosophy at Bard.

In the Model, the outcomes of a Deweyan concern with inquiry

were general characteristics observable in the educational system, in particular a definite structure in curriculum including an expected specialization in some area. But structure at Bard, it has been shown, resided solely in the student and in his use of the advisory system. It was the student, with the help of his counselor, who directed his own education, who was the ultimate judge of what was valuable in his educational plan. Now this assumption that the student has the understanding and the abilities to make such judgements was also the fundamental basis for the four-year major, which in turn was directly related to the admissions policy. Recall that Tewksbury stressed that, as at Bennington, preference would be given to applicants with proven abilities in a special field. Once at Bard, the successful candidate was to cultivate his prior interest by immediately embarking upon investigation of his chosen major. This policy effectively fixed the student into an educational pattern for the duration of his college years. In terms of Tewksbury's tree analogy, the major formed the sturdy trunk from which later explorations could grow.

However, it can be seen upon a little reflection that this sturdy tree was actually a sapling transplanted from earlier educational experiences such as secondary schools. It was to grow undisturbed by structure imposed by faculty or administration; it was to be tended by the student, pruned and fertilized in accord with his evaluation of how it grew. Clearly, college education was essentially in a sense an extension of the high school experience. New interests, wide-ranging explorations were thus relegated to a minor role. Growth in a direction fixed, in the usual case, even before admission was the norm;

experiment became an occasional and even a frivolous pastime.

This attitude pervaded the individual program. It also directed much of Bard's educational program. In abjuring structure in curriculum, in abdicating its role as a motivating element and assigning instead this responsibility to the press of pre-existing interests and abilities of the students, (Tewksbury, Note 10, pp. 1-2) Bard in essence abandoned the experimental approach on the college level. Thus it came about that the temper on campus was not, in contrast to that observed at Goddard, towards hypothesis, trial, evaluation, and then new hypothesis. Rather it was a closed system, with a central plan to be implemented. Seen from this perspective, the stability of Tewksbury's Plan is less surprising.

The romantic overtones of this Bardian philosophy can be readily outlined. Direction and restriction were to be avoided. Assuming that each and every student had the potential to make productive choices, the college need only nurture that growth. Assuming that the young man had the maturity to have identified already his life-long interest, the college was dedicated to non-interference. The romantic philosophy thus supplied no compulsion to faculty to stimulate new programs, to establish criteria by which to measure growth. Nor did it impose structure designed to provide the continuity and balance which Dewey found essential to good inquiry. Specialization at the romantic progressive college was in fact a constricting element. At a Deweyan college, with the focus on inquiry, it provides a deepening and expanding understanding of some area, and by its integration with its social core, a fuller conception of other fields.

The education that emerged at Bard bore little resemblance to the College of the Model. Only in the science and social studies areas could a concern with reflective thinking, with the importance of mastery of scientific method, be detected. Science steadily lost the status which it enjoyed at St. Stephen's and became instead a subject to be avoided.

There were apparent elements of Dewey's emphasis upon the social aspects of education--group learning in seminars, the Field Period, the Senior Project, the Community Government. But Dewey's social goal for education, the improvement of the democracy, was not visible. Rather the emphasis was upon the broad goal of a liberal education, specifically focused upon inducing habits of self-education for each, for use in college days and in future years. The lack of controls upon such social techniques as were incorporated into the Program provided no sound and general basis for achievement of Dewey's social goals for education.

In short, there was little of Deweyan philosophy evident in the educational practices at Bard.

Reference Notes

1. Bennington, Bard discuss policies this week-end. The Bardian, October 15, 1936, p. 1.

2. Committee goes to Bennington for conference. The Bardian, April 3, 1936, pp. 1, 2.

3. Dean Tewksbury quits position as head of Bard. The Bardian, November 5, 1937, p. 1.

4. Mestre, H. To the editor. The Bardian, November 30, 1937, p. 1.

5. Kline, R. Bard College. A self-evaluation for the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Febraury 1, 1963.

6. Evaluation of the educational effectiveness of Bard College, March 4-6, 1963.

7. Magee, C. The history of St. Stephen's College, 1869-1933. 1950. Unpublished Senior Project, Bard College.

8. Shwartzapel, M. Progressive higher education. Its background and aims. 1953. Unpublished Senior Project, Bard College.

9. C.L.M. Galley: Three, November 1955.

10. Tewksbury, D. An educational program for Bard College. March 1st, 1934. A preliminary statement for the consideration of the Board of Trustees. Mimeographed.

11. Leigh, R.D. The educational plan for Bennington College. (Revised edition. First edition issued March 1929.) New York: Bennington College, 1931. (Bennington Archives).

12. Leigh, R.D. Report of the acting Dean to the Trustees on budgeted income and expenditures for the first six months period. July 1, 1939-December 31, 1939.

13. Report of Board of Trustees, December 19, 1939.

14. Report of Board of Trustees, March 12, 1940.

15. Minutes of special meetings of the faculty, February 11 and February 13, 1944.

16. Case, J. Address, Opening address at the opening session of the Bard Symposium, February 19, 1952.

17. Trustees approve Bard College program, The Lyre Tree, May 18, 1934, pp. 1, 3, 4.

18. Liftig, Diane. A study of the Bard College graduates: 1948-1968. 1970. Unpublished Student Project, Bard College.

19. Rosenthal, M. Personal interview. November, 1979.

20. Survey of work reveals variety in field period. The Bardian, February 7, 1936, pp. 1, 2, 4.

21. Reading period over, students consider value. The Bardian, February 17, 1939, pp. 1, 4.

22. Senior projects are considered for class of '38. The Bardian, December 9, 1936, pp. 1-2.

23. Raushenbush, E. Address, Bard Symposium. February 19, 1952.

24. Hechinger, F. Summary and critique. Bard Symposium. February 19, 1952.

25. New constitution adopted by student convocation. The Lyre Tree, May 18, 1934, p. 1.

26. Bard to attend conference at Bennington. The Bardian, November 5, 1937, pp. 1, 4.

27. Forum reports on conference. The Bardian, October 28, 1936, pp. 1, 2.

28. Aspects of Plan. The Bardian, October 28, 1936, p. 1.

29. Report of Joint Meeting of Executive, Finance and Education Committees of the Board of Trustees of Bard College, March 30, 1937, pp. 19-24.

30. Butler sees Bard "Facing Forward." The Bardian, February 17, 1939, pp. 1, 4.

31. Dunham, D. On Bard's ideal. The Bardian, September 23, 1938, p. 2. (Letter to the editor.)

32. D.S., Letters to the editor. The Bardian, October 7, 1938, pp. 1, 2.

Reference List

Benezet, L. General education in the progressive college. New York: Arno Press, 1943/1971.

Community government. Bard College Bulletin, July 1940, p. 19.

The division of fine arts, music, and drama. Bard College Bulletin, December, 1940, pp. 23-31.

Dewey, J. Problems of men. New York: Philosophical Library, 1946.

The division of languages and literature. Bard College Bulletin, December, 1940, pp. 19-22.

The division of natural sciences. Bard College Bulletin, December, 1940, pp. 8-12.

The division of social studies. Bard College Bulletin, December, 1940, pp. 13-18.

Fields of study. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1936, pp. 27-29.

General information. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1936, pp. 27-29.

Gray, C. A summary of the Dean's report to the Trustees of Bard College. Bard College Bulletin, 1940-41, pp. 3-7.

History of the college. Bard College Bulletin, 1955-56, pp. 85-87.

Individual program of study. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1936, pp. 19-21.

Individualizing the courses. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1940, p. 6.

Liberal education and specialization. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1940, p. 4.

Members of the student body. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1936, pp. 52-57.

The senior project. Bard College Bulletin, March, 1940, p. 7.

Summary of enrollment. Bard College Bulletin, October, 1936, p. 2.

Summary of enrollment. Bard College Bulletin, May 1939, p. 56.

Summary of enrollment. Bard College Bulletin, July 1941, p. 19.

Tewksbury, D. The educational program of Bard College. School and Home, April 1935, pp. 651-659.

Underlying principles. Bard College Bulletin, March 1936, pp. 17-18.

CHAPTER VII

GODDARD COLLEGE

Goddard College, like Bennington, has been subjected to extensive criticism and comment. Unlike Bennington, whose attractive grounds were envied by the Goddard faculty (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 42), even the campus at Plainfield caused equivocal responses over the years. President Royce Pitkin was once moved to declare that it had a "certain homespun quality" (Note 2, p. 1). A former faculty member (one not particularly enamored of Goddard) described it as a "small experimental college in the hills of northern New England--half hidden, as if ashamed" (Morreale, 1965, p. 578). A visiting teacher from a Danish Folk School wrote:

> Situated among the green hills and built into the former barns and outhouses of a large estate . . . , this small liberal arts college does not look like much of a place. (Severinsen, Note 3, p. 7)

Another visitor commented on the appearance of the Greatwood Farms estate (home of Goddard).

> In itself a functional, though not an especially well-kept campus, [it] is set in lovely Vermont hills. New buildings have been added and old ones remodeled, but a sense of informality and earthiness remains. (Dressel, 1969, p. 224)

But to a historian, one of the most telling descriptions came from a young librarian who arrived at Goddard in 1953. Two years later, he prepared a report, "From Chaos to Order," detailing his first days at the college. For example:

> The college sits on the shoulder of a hill. To one city bred, the whole had a singularly unpeopled look, with something stark even in the lushness of the greens. . . . It was with a visit to the library that we closed our tour of the campus. Brown-shingled like the other buildings, the library . . . smelled musty. On the main floor, where the stalls were, are an office, a work room, the circulation desk, and the main reading room, with book and magazine shelves. Upstairs, in what once was the hayloft, are more books. . . . The classification seemed overly simple; there were hundreds of dead flies and wasps on the window sills. . . . This is a library of no more than 9,000 collected books. . . . a goodly number of duplicates. . . . little bundles of catalogue cards to be found in every drawer. . . . the office file is a shambles. . . . The library needed both better organization and more books. (Martineau, Note 4, pp. 1-4)

Campus publications shared the fate of the library in those early years. According to a student who attempted a report on student publications at Goddard:

> This exploration is subject to inaccuracy due to the considerable handicap of there being no file in existence of the publications. This is unfortunate as some of these editions are well worth preserving; in addition they provide a student record of the changing trends and times of the college. Of the many different issues appearing during the past years, only two random copies are on the shelves of the college library. A fairly large but far from complete assortment of the newspapers and literary efforts lie unsorted in the college archives. (Barnes, Note 5, p. 1)

The informality of the campus proves to be an accurate foretaste of some aspects of education at Goddard, but the informality of the library arrangements portends problems for the historical researcher, since it implies a casual attitude toward the college archives. Dr. Mattuck, faculty member since the first, rationalized that at Goddard, the focus was upon the "current" and the "now," downplaying the past, except as one needed the past to understand the present (Note 1, p. 49).

Because there has only recently been a concern for maintaining historical records, and because there is evidence that the basic

philosophy of Goddard changed little over Dr. Pitkin's thirty-one years at the college, the use of data from years beyond the first decade of operation is justified and necessary.

Fortunately, there do exist a few records on the founding of Goddard. From these a brief account of the sequence of events can be reconstructed.[1] Interviews with the former president, Dr. Pitkin, and other long-time members of the faculty and staff have enriched the written records.

Founding of Goddard

It is difficult to select the most appropriate approach to this topic--should the emphasis be upon the college or upon its prime mover, Dr. Pitkin? The paths of these two intersected professionally in 1935, and to understand the Goddard that emerged, it is important to become acquainted with each. To accomplish this goal, the facts leading to the establishment of the tiny college at Plainfield in 1938 will be reviewed. Then a section will be devoted to Dr. Pitkin, known to all who ever spent more than ten minutes with him as "Tim." He is so designated henceforth in this paper.

The early history of Goddard. The institution was voted into life in the midst of the Civil War. The Vermont Universalist Convention decided in 1863 to establish a co-educational school to be called the

---

[1]This and much of the other data used in this study were graciously provided by Corinne Elliot, at present acting as custodian of the archives in addition to her regular assignment as Director of Central Records.

Green Mountain Central Institute. Barre's Universalists raised $10,000 for the honor of hosting the school. In 1870 it opened in that city. A major contribution came from Mrs. Thomas Goddard, widow of a "wealthy Universalist philanthropist" from Boston. Thus, the school was in its first year renamed Goddard Seminary. The Universalist liberal tradition continued, but as the years passed, the educational needs of the community it served changed. In 1930, as the public high schools decimated its student pool, it adapted by becoming a girls' school (Salisbury, Note 6, p. 1).

The Seminary had sound reasons for existing in its early days. There were at that time few public high schools. Many denominations founded academies for their youth. However, the children of Universalist families, who believed in universal salvation and the sacred worth of the individual, were sometimes denied access to these other schools, because of their "heretical" views. Another function of the Seminary was as a "fitting school" for Tufts College, which also had Universalist affiliations ("When Goddard," Note 7, p. 1). But the future of the Seminary lay with the activities of one of its own, "Tim."

Tim. The Pitkin family had a long involvement with Goddard Seminary. Tim recalled that "I had known it all my life because my family was involved. All my brothers graduated from there; I did; my father had gone, only didn't graduate; my grandfather was on the Board of Trustees" (Pitkin, Note 8, pp. 6-7). From Marshfield, Tim's hometown, he naturally went to the Seminary, graduating in 1914, then on to the University of Vermont, Cornell, and to Teachers College at Columbia, where

he finished his doctorate in 1932. During these years he had also garnered ten years of experience in public school teaching and administration. At this point, Tim accepted an appointment as Headmaster of a new public high school at New London, New Hampshire, called into existence because of the conversion of coeducational Colby Academy into Colby Junior College for Girls, leaving the town without secondary school facilities.

This idea of a junior college was new to Tim. In that small town, it was inevitable that the educators of the two schools exchange ideas, and the junior college concept intrigued Tim. In time, when conditions suggested that a move was in order, Tim tried out the idea of a junior college at Goddard on a former Goddard classmate. He found that it had indeed been considered at his alma mater. In consequence, in July of 1935, Tim became director of a junior college for women at Goddard. The two college years were added to the existing structure of a four year secondary school and ran as such for three years.

The antiquity of the buildings soon impelled a change in site. Tim grasped this opportunity to institute a close look at the whole educational system at the school. There was collected a group of influential persons--"people in the field of education; the Governor, George Aiken; a leading industrial manufacturer, Ralph Flanders, who later became a U.S. senator; Dorothy Canfield Fisher" (p. 9). The group convened in New York at Columbia Men's Faculty Club early in 1938.

Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick headed the conference. Tim recalled: "He [Kilpatrick] had kind of a diverse group there, but he did

a remarkable job of pulling ideas together" (Note, 8, p. 3).[2] The group produced a statement of principles for what it proposed to do, for creating a new institution. (See Appendix C1.) The Aims for the planned Goddard College, which was to be a four year junior college composed of the last two years of high school and the first two of college, were printed in the last catalog of Goddard Seminary in 1938. (See Appendix C2.)

In June, 1938, Goddard Seminary closed. Goddard College, inheriting some 3,000 books and eventually about $7,000 (Martineau, Note 4, p. 1) moved in July to the Greatwood Estate Farm in Plainfield.[3]

The junior college concept in this form, from which the student would go directly on to graduate school, was, Tim had thought, to be the "wave of the future" (Pitkin, Note 10, p. 8). When the expected trend failed to materialize, Goddard began to add the last two years of college, dropping off the high school years. By 1945, the secondary school division was gone. The first bachelor's degrees were given to two students in 1943.

As president for 31 years at Plainfield, Tim's influence has been profound. Professor Mattuck has reminded us:

---

[2] See Mattuck's comment on Kilpatrick's skill in managing a discussion (Chapter IV, footnote 11).

[3] This property was purchased in March, 1939, with no down payment other than the rent already paid under the option to buy ($2500) (Pitkin, Note 9, pp. 2-3). This is just one of the many indications of the shoestring finances characteristic of Goddard for most of its early history. Compare this with Bennington's 1.25 million dollars with which it began operation. (Bennington College," 1932, p. 3)

> Only Tim's faith and pigheadedness ever got this place started in '38. We started literally on a shoestring. Bennington, as you know, took six years to collect the money to open. . . . [We had] no luxuries and constant struggle, not altogether to be sneezed at in terms of your identity and sense of worthwhileness. (Note 1, p. 43)

The young visiting faculty member, Severinsen, emphasized Tim's consistency coupled with flexibility. "He was never a Mr. Know-All, but always open and willing to listen; he argued experiments and study with the purpose of achieving new knowledge rather than traditional beliefs" (Severinsen, Note 3, p. 1).

Professor Beecher, faculty member for years and active in many phases of Goddard life, recently confirmed this impression: "Our leader's Deweyan preferences were continually tested and enlarged or qualified" (Beecher, Note 11, p. 1). Corinne Elliott was struck by the manner in which Goddard and Tim grew together.

> That was one of the remarkable parts, and still is, about Tim--that he continues to take in new ideas. He demonstrates his own philosophy of education; he is always changing--not in a basic way, but his ideas. . . . He's very open. (Elliott, Note 12, p. 1)

All the data indicate that Goddard was essentially shaped by Tim's philosophy and controlled largely by his personality, by "the enormous hidden strength in the cussed independence . . . [that develops from] growing up around a farm [as] Tim did" (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 29). It was Tim who pushed the faculty along in the direction of his philosophy (p. 9).

Influences. Tim's philosophy thus guided for more than thirty years this new college as it grew from tiny to small. The question of interest to this study lies, of course, in the nature of his philosophy

of education. When Tim was questioned directly as to the influences that shaped Goddard's philosophy (which equates to his own), Tim made several replies:

> I think there's no question that [Dewey's] thinking influenced the college greatly in the beginning and I hope it has continued to do so. You wonder sometimes. Not directly, however, [since] Dewey was never at the college. In fact, I only met him once. . . . I think we were influenced by what you might think of as disciples, particularly Boyd Bode, who at that time was a professor at Ohio State University. . . . I was much impressed by his views on education, his interpretation of Dewey. (Note 8, pp. 2-3)

> [The faculty] by and large tended to be committed to the basic philosophy of the college which was strongly influenced by John Dewey. (p. 41)

> I don't think it's proper to say [that Goddard] was modeled after John Dewey. We were terrifically influenced by Dewey's thinking. Largely, however, from the outset [we were influenced] through Kilpatrick. . . . But I began reading Dewey, as a matter of fact, when I was taking a course . . . in secondary education. And then the first year at Goddard as a faculty, we began reading some Dewey. The first book . . . was Art as Experience, . . . later a good many of us read Experience and Education. So we were greatly influenced by Dewey's thoughts. It seemed to fit what we were trying to do.[4] (Pitkin, Note 10, pp. 12-13)

Publications by or about the college often employed what might be dubbed "Dewey talk": a curriculum organized around "the purposes and the reconstruction of experiences of students" ("Rebuilding," Note 13, p. 7); the "experimental notion, the 'learn to do by doing' of John Dewey" ("Is College Just a Place to Do Time?", 1976, p. 11); "thought is being tested by action, theories are being tried by the test of living" ("The College Community," 1941, p. 1). A 1966 report used phrases familiar to all Dewey scholars: start with the

---

[4]This last sentence seems rather a cart-before-the-horse type of comment.

individual; learning is natural and active; education is the reconstruction of the experience of the individual by himself for himself; education is a transactional process and a social process (Beecher, Chickering, Hamlin, & Pitkin, 1966, pp. 2-3).

But as Tim said, it was Dewey's disciples, Bode and Kilpatrick, who interpreted to him Dewey's philosophy. It was Kilpatrick who took a direct part in the organization of Goddard. As chairman of the 1938 Conference, he left his mark upon the statement of purposes that resulted ("When Goddard," Note 7, p. 3). (See Appendix C1.) Again, at the end of the first semester at Greatwood, on January 13-14, 1939, Kilpatrick chaired another conference at Goddard, where the group looked at what had been accomplished educationally in the new institution. This was the first of many in a series of Conferences on Current Educational Issues, the first several of which were also headed by Kilpatrick (Pitkin, Note 8, p. 4).

On May 25, 1940, Kilpatrick was a participant in a fifteen minute NBC broadcast on Goddard College, which resulted in a large number of inquiries about the college (Pitkin, Note 14). The Goddard Bulletin, in 1941, printed a two page quotation from Kilpatrick under the heading "What Goddard Stands For" (1941, pp. 5-6). In 1942 the President's Report recorded a donation from Kilpatrick of $25 to the Twenty Thousand Fund, one of the larger donations[5] (Pitkin, Note 15, p. 4). On October 28, 1961, a dinner was given in honor of Kilpatrick in the course of a conference at Goddard. It was reported that Tim reminisced

---

[5]Governor Aiken gave $10; the trustees gave (at the Twenty Thousand dinner) in toto $10; the Goddard College Community $107.54.

about the transformation of Kilpatrick House from horse barn to dormitory:

> Changes in Kilpatrick House symbolize Dr. Kilpatrick's philosophy . . . simple and practical and yet radical. . . . Tim recalled Kilpatrick's early association with the college. Indirectly he had influenced Goddard through [his] classes and his writing. He played a more direct role by participation in the formal planning session at Goddard Seminary in 1938 and in the first winter conference on Educational Issues . . . In conclusion, Tim asserted that Kilpatrick "without doubt influenced the development of Goddard more than any other person." ("Fall 1961," Note 16, p. 4)

In 1963, at the final meeting of the Community (then 25 years old), Tim spoke nostalgically of the past:

> Robert Frost . . . nearly twenty-five years ago sat on a table under the maples on the South Lawn and read poetry to us. On the same occasion William Heard Kilpatrick talked with us about education, philosophy, and religion. (Pitkin, Note 17, p. 1)

Apparently, the first Goddard students were directly exposed to the charm of the Million Dollar Professor. Tim reminded his students a generation later of the effects of Kilpatrick's "invaluable contributions" to the college (p. 3).

This strong emphasis upon Dewey and Kilpatrick contrasts with the prominence of the progressive movement at Bennington. There was a connection of Goddard with progressive education, but often it was at a once-removed stage. Kilpatrick, at the dinner mentioned above, was, it is true, introduced as "the elder stateman of the progressive education movement" (Note 17, p. 4). In addition, at least two of the most influential members of the faculty had solid connections with progressive education. Professor Mattuck "blew in on a snowstorm," as Tim recalled, while on a conscious search for a position in a progressive school (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 4). Will Hamlin was "a progressive school

child . . . , went to an experimental kindergarten at Teachers College, and first and second grade. . . . fifth and sixth grades at the Dalton School . . . Antioch College for three years, then . . . Black Mountain . . . for two and a half years" (Hamlin, Note 18, p. 1).

There are also records showing that faculty often attended and hosted conferences of progressive educators, such as the Conferences on Educational Issues.

Yet Evalyn Bates, one of the first two graduates of Goddard and for many years assistant to the President, said,

> I think Bennington would tend to regard itself more as a progressive college. Goddard has never really liked that meaning for [itself]; they liked experimental. (Bates, Note 19, p. 28)

Tim struck a similar note.

> We had our own views about what education ought to be and we were committed to the so-called progressive ideas in education. But in actual practice, it was something else. (Pitkin, Note 8, p. 14)

> Bennington, of course, represented the progressive movement. Kilpatrick was chairman of the Board at Bennington for awhile, helping them get organized. Later Kilpatrick said that he thought that Goddard came much closer to carrying out the basic Dewey idea and his own ideas than Bennington did. (Note 10, p. 14)

Clearly, Tim implied a separation between Deweyan thought and progressive education. The next sections examine the Educational Plan at Goddard and test out the validity of Tim's and Kilpatrick's statements.

The Educational Plan

When Goddard turned 25, Newsweek wrote a brief commentary on its origins.

> Goddard came late to the ferment of educational experiment between world wars. . . . Vermont-born, Goddard-educated Tim Pitkin turned it into a college in 1938 . . . [but] the biggest innovations of that progressive era had already been tried elsewhere. Goddard tried them, too: Off-campus work terms, student-dominated community government, deep-probe counseling--these innovations and more were imported from the likes of Antioch, Sarah Lawrence and Bennington. ("Goddard at 25," 1963, p. 29)

There was certainly much truth to this lay opinion. An official Goddard document even added to the list of those to whom their program was indebted. Beginning with the Universalist tradition and its interpretation by Drs. Kilpatrick and Pitkin, it included Bennington, "from which many details of the Goddard program were borrowed," Sarah Lawrence, Reed, the new Antioch, Black Mountain, the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin and New College at Columbia. Even St. John's (whose philosophy was not sympathetic to Goddard's) was part of the "intellectual climate" that flourished in higher education at the time, and Goddard was part of this "ferment" ("When Goddard," Note 7, p. 4).

Goddard's Educational Plan did call for the "traditional" progressive innovations, much as Newsweek has reported. It was to be a "school for living." The cost of education would be in most part borne by the student. Classes were not pre-scheduled, but would be formed in the usual academic areas as "the needs and interests of the students require" (p. 7). However, opportunities for independent study would be

available. Vocational work might serve as a focus for a student's educational program. No course requirements were established.

The month of January was set aside as a work and reading period. "The regular college students [were to] seek apprentice jobs in the field of their major interest or devote themselves to reading in those fields" (p. 8). During this term, the college plant would be used for the adult education program, an important feature of the Goddard Plan.

Admission was, as at Bennington, based upon the quality of work rather than upon specific courses of study. "Factors such as scholarship, leadership, maturity, seriousness of purpose, personality, reliability, versatility, and artistic talent will be considered . . . [as well] as the recommendations of the principal" (p. 12).

Standards and rules for the community life were to be determined by the joint action of the students and faculty. In fact, a constitution was shortly adopted providing for a weekly meeting of the Community and for a Community Council to execute the policies set by the Community (pp. 13-14).

Each student would be assigned a Counselor, usually a person in his field of interest whose duty it was to assist in arranging the student's program. Grades were not to be given, nor were periodic written reports to be compiled for either student or parent's use. However, personal consultations on the progress of the student were welcomed. The Counselor, using accumulated records from other instructors, descriptions of project work, and other such data, would assist the student in evaluating the quality of his own work. Standards of

achievement were to be the equivalent of that at the best senior colleges ("The Educational Plan," 1939).

Yet in spite of the many similarities to existing plans, Goddard was convinced that it offered something unique--"building its program around the experiences and perceptions of its students and faculty more than about academic subject matters" ("Education and Freedom," 1971, p. 25). As has been mentioned earlier, the Kilpatrick Conference in 1938 established the basic Aims of Goddard. (See Appendix C1.) The first catalog stated:

> It is true that many colleges have adopted one or more of these purposes and that no new purpose is proposed, but so far as is known, no one college in America has attempted an educational program in which all these aims are unified. ("The Educational Plan," 1939, p. 4)

Where the real uniqueness of Goddard lay will be better seen as this "Vermont School for Living" is evaluated against the Deweyan Model.

Goddard and the Model

At Goddard, unlike at Bennington, review of the data led to the conclusion that the published aims of the college were closely related to practice. Thus evaluation of Goddard has relied on stated aims as well as their day-by-day implementation on campus. The focal point was, of course, the Aims published in the last catalog of Goddard Seminary and Junior College in 1938. (See Appendix C2.) In 1961, Tim spoke at a conference on Goals and Practices of College Education. He there reviewed these and discussed their implementation at Goddard over the intervening years. At this time, he also undertook a restatement

of Goddard's philosophy. This speech serves as a primary source of great importance, since it defined both theory and practice over a period of 23 years (Note 20).

Reflective thinking: Scientific method. Examination of the eight Aims of Goddard College revealed no direct reference to the teaching of scientific method or to reflective thinking, nor does Tim's explication of these Aims. However in his restatement of the philosophy (which, he noted, had essentially not changed) he focused on the Deweyan concept of education as growth, although not mentioning the Dewey connection. One of the outcomes of education which took growth as a basic assumption, Tim stated, was this:

> If we regard the nature of education as being that of growth, we would say it would consist of confronting problems, of defining problems, of understanding the nature of the problems, and then of formulating proposals for solving these problems . . . formulating hypotheses . . . then trying out these proposals. (Note 20, p. 8)

This is, of course, an unequivocal description of scientific method, of reflective thinking.

Returning now momentarily to the eight Aims of the college, there is apparent an enormous emphasis upon life and living: education for real living through facing real life problems; education is a process for securing a better understanding of life; vocational studies are part of living; integration of college life with community life; the community as a laboratory in which students may see life as a whole.

If one then combines Tim's outlook upon education as growth, implying a scientific approach to problems, with this integration of

education and life, it becomes permissible to acknowledge as part of Tim's philosophy an inherent dedication to teaching students a reflective approach to life. He has said:

> It is not our job as teachers to see that our students cover a certain amount of ground or know a certain per cent of the right answers, but . . . it is our job to provide opportunities for students to educate themselves for living. (Pitkin, Note 21, p. 1)[6]

There remains no doubt, after further perusal of Tim's recorded speeches, that he was dedicated to the scientific approach in the classroom, in educational experimentation, in life itself. Examples will be given which support this conclusion in sections below, "Scientific Teaching Methods" and "An Experimental College."

There is also evidence that Tim did try to interpret his philosophy to the faculty--by faculty study of Dewey; by the use of faculty meetings as in-service education of faculty (see "Teaching Methods" below); by talks and speeches. On at least two occasions, he evaluated his success in this area:

> Inherent in the idea that the studies of a student should . . . be based on problems regarded by him as important and real was the expectation that there would be a strong emphasis throughout the College on the use--in class and out--of critical and reflective thinking. A Senior Division student told me a few days ago that she thought that the expectation had not been fulfilled. After some reflection of my own, I regretfully concur in her judgment. (Note 17, p. 10)

When asked, "Do you think that in the early years at Goddard, most of your courses were taught using the principles of scientific

---

[6]This also clarifies some of Goddard's sense of uniqueness, of what was meant by building its program around the experiences of the student and the faculty rather than about subject matter. (See page 269.)

inquiry?", Tim replied that he wasn't sure, but that he didn't think so (Note 8, pp. 33-34).

A self-study at Goddard in 1956 produced scientific data indicating a genuine problem in this area. Hamlin interpreted the study results as below:

> Another [problem] is related to the objective of helping students learn scientific problem-solving methods, as widely applicable tools. The evidence from the study is that while Goddard teaching is effective . . . in helping students know and understand a subject-matter area in real depth, it pays less attention to systematic problem solving in so doing than had been assumed. A question arises: whether the learning-in-depth is in any sense a product of a non-systematic inductive rather than analytical approach, or whether systematic analysis would help learning go even deeper. (Hamlin, 1957, p. 206)

Clearly, reflective thinking and scientific inquiry were no strangers to Tim (who was formerly a science teacher). Clearly, he thought it integral to education. But it is less clear to what extent it pervaded the educational system at Goddard. The Model suggests that proper handling of science in the curriculum might establish a practical emphasis upon scientific inquiry. An examination of the teaching of science at Goddard follows, in order to further investigate this issue.

Science at Goddard. There was, of course, no requirement for science at Goddard, formal or informal. Considerable evidence indicates that science was avoided by students in general. Little statistical data were found as to actual numbers of students in science courses. However, Tim did report in September, 1946, on the distribution of enrollments for the fall semester. Calculations from that data show that about 17 per cent of all class enrollments in the Junior

College were in science, in both the liberal studies (Science and Living, and Conservation of Natural Resources) and in the Specialized Studies (Biology and Chemistry) (Pitkin, Note 22, p. 4). The catalog for 1965 reported that a survey showed that nine-tenths of all graduates of the past 15 years had done some work in science (leaving ten per cent with no science) ("What Students Study," 1965, p. 48). In 1974, a student doing yet another of the countless surveys indigenous to the campus investigated the records of the graduates for the three or four years immediately past. She found that there were very few graduates at that time who had not had some exposure to science (although no definition was offered of "few") (Hamlin, Note 18, pp. 17-18).

However, several authoritative sources indicate that the rate of participation in sciences was low. Tim stated directly that few Goddard students were interested in science (Note 8, p. 10). The implication was that this was a rather chronic state of affairs. Tim recalled that around 1948, when the committee for the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools "came to look at us to see if we were fit to join them, [they] said . . . that [we] weren't doing enough work in science. Well, how do you do more work in science? If the kids won't take the courses, what do you do?" (p. 21). Accreditation was finally gained in 1959 (after being refused a second time in 1958). An analysis of the areas of change that brought about the final success in obtaining accreditation made no mention of great changes in the science area except the comment that science offerings were improved (Scott, 1966, p. 92). Beecher reported some "pick-up in number

and scope of science courses but not much gain in student enrollment in the sciences" (Beecher et al., 1966, p. 37). As late as 1963, Tim said:

> As a faculty we have given inadequate attention to the natural sciences and have not succeeded in helping students to use them in ways that will result in more intelligent behavior (Note 17, p. 9)

Therefore, the conclusion is that in the eyes of both the President and of outside evaluators, Goddard consistently appeared to place little emphasis upon science. Two student reports (1963 and 1966) painted a similar picture. If one assumes that no sharp peak and trough of scientific excellence intervened between 1938 and 1966, their accounts may be interpreted as a "steady state" of affairs in science.

The 1963 report (Boris, Note 23, pp. 6-8) was a compilation of remarks by "three men of science" who were leaving Goddard that year. One instructor, identified only as "Ralph," commented:

> One of the problems has been that the interest in science among students is not widespread. Perhaps this is due to the sort of students who come to Goddard. Perhaps students really interested in going into science . . . would select a school with a more rigid curriculum, more laboratory facilities. Goddard students tend to place science in their value system as not good. (p. 7)

"Seldon" added, "Students at Goddard see science as peripheral to their other interests" (p. 7).[7]

The 1966 paper (a Senior Project) contained a section devoted to a "survey of the current status of science at Goddard." Although the statistical base of the survey (9 questionnaires returned out of 12 sent to instructors and their students) may be suspect, the paper does

---

[7] If true, this is surely a sad commentary upon a Deweyan college.

provide some qualitative impact. The student reported as a base assumption that the number of students in science "has been and is" extremely small. His conclusion was:

> Our people aren't interested in science. Hence the College has an antique, inadequate laboratory . . . and a small group of young, inexperienced instructors, only some of whom are knowledgeable and perhaps none capable of igniting a researcher's flame in the minds of our students. . . . Goddard students are not interested in science largely because Goddard's administrative and educative leaders are not interested in science; rather they are interested in people. . . . Goddard has second and third rate instructors who are also part-time philosophers. (Nientzow, Note 24, pp. 9-10)

Quite obviously, Goddard was in no one's eyes a huge success in science. However, even the disenchanted Senior pointed out courses that can be seen to have a Deweyan stamp, such as Ideas of Modern Science (a philosophy of science course). An investigation of the early endeavors in science at Goddard indicate that, while science was not given a high priority and was not used as a general tool for the teaching of reflective thought, much of what was offered was done in the Deweyan mode.

Deweyan aspects of science at Goddard. When Tim was asked how science was treated at Goddard, he predictably replied:

> We did the same with science as we did with any other field. The person who taught the courses . . . made proposals before a course. For example, the very earliest years, we did some work in wild-life management. . . . [The young man in charge] designed the program. . . . and [took] the kids out into the field. They did a very thorough study . . . of the Winooski River which . . . flows through . . . the campus. (Note 8, p. 20)

The Records Office shows that the Wild-Life Management course was offered for three years, 1939-41. The "young man in charge" wrote this review of the course:

> During the early fall, some time was devoted to the study and collecting of local woody plants and their seeds. A food availability study of trout was begun in local streams by the square-foot sampling method . . . Game surveys were made periodically . . . near Goddard. Other survey work was done in the Groton State Forest area in collaboration with the Vermont Fish and Game Service . . . Stomachs of game birds and animals were obtained for study when possible. Considerable attention has been devoted to tracking and reading of signs of feeding. (McCauley, Note 25)

This course was certainly innovative (especially for those days) and in line with Deweyan thought, integrating several areas of science, employing a scientific approach to problem solving. Other conservation courses were given--Environmental Science (1939), Ecology (1943), Upper Winooski Valley Biology (1943), Use and Conservation of Natural Resources (1946). These were all well ahead of the national trend in this direction. The list of offerings in the first years showed other courses with at least Deweyan titles: Photographic Science, Science and Modern Society, Science and Living, Human Biology.

Since Chemistry was of particular interest to this writer, the course reviews of two chemistry classes were located and examined. The teaching of General Chemistry in 1948 was far from traditional. A standard text, Babor and Lerman, was used but numerous "omissions, additions, and modifications" were employed to make the course more interesting--including omitting the mathematical questions in the problem sections. "It was principles, rather than practice, that we were after." Discussions, field trips and laboratory work as students felt the need were utilized. The instructor reported:

> The class at mid-semester was divided in their support of this method. Some favored sticking to the technicalities of the text, while others preferred to reap much culture from our "diversions and digressions" . . . There were times when the

> Goddard Values were subordinated, by popular demand, to a worried delving into the academic esoterica of B. and L. . . . I think that Goddard outweighed B. and L. in the end, however, and the students gained a knowledge of principle, and an appreciation of the methods and importance of Chemistry in modern living, together with a working knowledge of the reactions and chemical interplay in ordinary surroundings and industry. (Pierce, Note 26)

Before commenting upon this approach to chemistry, this observer decided that a look at Organic Chemistry, taught in the same year by the same instructor, would be informative.

> We did the usual think in aliphatic and cyclic compounds. . . . getting just a little of the theory before taking up what constituted the bulk of our work--special topics. . . . Dyes, nutrition, textiles, hormones, plastics, materials of industry, industrial processes--all were grist to our mill. . . . It was my impression that at times there was not very much interest in formal Organic Chemistry. . . . Also there was little laboratory work done, but what was done seemed to fill a need, and was carefully carried out. (Pierce, Note 27)

An important question that a traditional chemistry teacher might raise at this point would be the appropriateness of this approach at the college level. Like the "worried" students in General chemistry (who were "pre-med, pre-engineering, pre-this and that"), the chemist frets about the non-mathematical approach, the sparseness of laboratory experience, the emphasis upon special topics. Surely Dewey, with his insistence upon the rightful place of vocation in the college program, would not want to see a student poorly prepared for his life's work. In answer to such doubts, the instructor would likely point to the flexibility of the class work. In General Chemistry, the emphasis fluctuated between "academic esoterica" and "diversions and digressions." A student needing the mathematical preparation would be expected to insist upon it, either in class or in individual work.

Obviously, though, the argument would continue, this puts a heavy burden upon the student, who may not be fully aware of the demands of his profession. But, counters the Deweyan professor, that is exactly the role of the counselor. And that is education at Goddard, where the student is responsible for his own education. In fact, in 1899, Dewey said:

> The amount of information that a person requires in existing society is comparatively a small thing. The necessary amount of training, of control of his powers, of judgement, observation, and action, is very great, but any person who has that control can, with the facilities for getting information through the libraries, magazines, and the possibilities of utilizing the experiences of other people when desired, get on with a comparatively small amount of information. (Dewey, 1899, p. 121)

From either point of view, Chemistry at Goddard had many appealing aspects. It appears as well that graduates of Goddard (including the non-science students) tested fairly well in the science area. Assuming again a "steady state" in science over the years, data from later years provides valuable insight.

Achievement in science. A 1956 self-study reported that Goddard teaching was highly successful in the area of content, citing results of the Graduate Record Examination given to students who had completed two years at the college. The average of the group was at the 87th percentile in the humanities and social-sciences and the 62nd percentile in the natural sciences. The report, however, qualified the findings, since the sample size was "too small . . . to be conclusive" (Hamlin, 1957, pp. 202-203). This initial project was followed by a longitudinal study of the classes of '64 and '65, scientifically devised and implemented, called "An Experiment in College Curriculum

Organization" (Beecher et al., 1966).

The students in this study showed significant increases (ranging from $p > .01$ to $p > .05$) in scores on the GRE in Natural Science, on the Test of Critical Thinking, the Test of Critical Thinking in Social Sciences, and on Science Reading and Understanding (pp. 52-56). Unfortunately, comparisons with national norms were not reported. Tim, however, in 1963, reported that at that time the averages on the GRE for college Seniors were "as good or better than 57 percent of college seniors in the humanities and as good or better than 46 percent in the natural sciences (Pitkin, Note 17, p. 10). Chickering pointed out an interesting correlation between gains in scores on tests of critical thinking and study of natural science. His research showed that one group of students who took no significant amounts of science during their last two years were only able to maintain the means obtained on such tests at the end of their sophomore year. No gains in the power to think critically were made in the two remaining years on campus (Chickering, 1969/1971, p. 211).

If one takes into account the low participation in science courses relative to that of the population on which the norms for the GRE are based, the achievement record, although not impressive, appears adequate.

Additional expectations. Again, there is a concern for those students who undertook no science and those who had minimized their contacts with the sciences. There seemed to be no certain route to a facility with scientific thinking for these persons. Although the data showed that on the average students improved in this respect, the

individual had no clear-cut path toward excellence in reflective thinking. The statistical gains must be attributed to direct involvement in science courses for some, contact with individual teachers who considered scientific thinking important, courses which integrated scientific method as a tool, a counselor who pointed his charge in that direction, independent study that developed that area, or perhaps to the natural process of maturation. No consistent plan was established to ensure that each student acquire habits of reflective thinking.

Conclusions. Although Tim's philosophy clearly embraced Dewey's concept of reflective thinking as a major goal of education, and although the literature of Goddard College frequently implied a similar dedication to scientific method, there were no means built into the program to implement that particular end. The reliance upon the individual to build his or her own program, upon the counselor to assist the student, although in essence compatible with Dewey's philosophy, was not counterbalanced by a structure which would provide certain routes towards this carefully defined goal, or the supervision necessary to ensure that the student find the path most compatible with his/her interests. In this sense, Goddard does not meet the standards set by the Model. However, it must be added that the most powerful indirect influence of all, Tim's incessant insistence upon the application of scientific method in many areas, must indeed have had an effect upon the Goddard student.

This topic was discussed with Charles Zerby, a graduate of Goddard and for a time Director of Admissions there. He strongly supported the concept of a pervasive experimental attitude at Goddard.

Always, he said, there were testing and evaluation. His first days on campus as a Freshman were unexpectedly spent taking a battery of examinations lasting two or three days--"GRE's, all the psych tests and everything" (Zerby, Note 28, pp. 8-10). Although such activities were not direct participation of the students in inquiry, they were illustrative to the students of the dedication of the college to a scientific approach to education. Surely a graduate of Goddard must have absorbed at least a practical acquaintance with scientific method. Perhaps this factor was an important one in the level of achievement in science noted above.

Education as social. It is in this area that Goddard reveals its true uniqueness. As has been pointed out, the Aims of the college expressed many times the idea of education as integral with life, echoing Dewey's long battle against the dualism which set education apart from the world. Although the concept was not original with Goddard, the extent of practice and conscious emphasis at the college made it an outstanding feature of the Goddard Plan and of a Goddard education. Here, too, Kilpatrick's interpretation of Dewey ruled. It was in 1924 that Kilpatrick told his audience of Bennington's founders that education was life, not preparation for life. This aspect of Dewey's thought, strained through his disciple's philosophy, appears to have been the controlling force in Goddard's history. Tim often turned to Kilpatrick's words on the subject, as he did in his 1961 speech on the Goddard College philosophy, when he closed with these remarks:

> The gist . . . of Goddard's educational philosophy throughout the twenty-three years it has been operating and today is contained in the affirmation of William Heard Kilpatrick that "We

> learn what we live, we learn each item we live as we accept it, and we learn it in the degree we accept it." (Pitkin, Note 20, p. 12)

The key to Goddard education thus lay in the emphasis upon the felt needs, the use of real life problems as the focus of studies. At Goddard there was not only a verbal but also a practical dedication to this concept. And at Goddard, real life, even during the college years, was not bounded by classroom walls or campus acres. It extended to society at large.[8]

Classroom. At Goddard, according to the Bulletin for 1941, study life was democratic and real. Students interested in a particular field found faculty with similar interests and a group was formed. Together they decided the direction in which the group would go ("The College Community," 1941, p. 3). This procedure was somewhat modified with time (see "Structure" below) but the basic concept remained the same. Study began with the real concerns and needs of the students in thr group; the group functioned as a social unit. The predominance of the group discussion method or some variation of it implied a social responsibility for the individual to prepare himself for participation. Severinsen, the same young man who thought Goddard did not look like much of a place upon first glance, concluded after a closer look that

> [Goddard] is a stronghold for educational democracy. In each group, in a spirit of cooperation for the achievement of common

---

[8]The Goddard Bulletin said, "The fundamental notion [is] that a curriculum must involve the entire life of the college and, by necessary abstraction, of society at large" (1965, p. 51).

> goals, the individual should give his best and thus fulfill his need both for recognition by others and for creative self-expression. (Note 3, p. 9)[9]

This enthusiastic response can be balanced against a rather vitriolic account of the conduct of a "typical" class.

> One of the older members . . . had said to me when I joined the Community, "You are free to do as you wish with your groups, but I suggest you allow them the freedom of the mind. It's creative individuality that concerns us. Don't be upset by the apparently vile language; they use it only to test themselves and us.
>
> The arguments [in the classroom] became more and more heated until two boys almost came to blows . . . I cowardly dismissed the class rather than leave them fighting. . . . I was made aware of the catalog's remark that "individuality and character are to be developed through the community." (Morreale, 1965, p. 581)

These two opposed reactions epitomize the strong and conflicting responses that Goddard has evoked over the years. And surely, the demands of teaching without the external constraints of the traditional lecture and examination system were great. But, assuming that the classroom was competently managed, the Goddard system began its involvement with real life problems in a social setting in the classroom.

Campus. The campus which Dressel had described as unkempt was the same campus which, he suggested, also contributed to a sense of community, indirectly teaching that "people and ideas" were valued more

---

[9]The student paper, Goddard Record, on Tuesday, March 7, 1939 carried this paragraph: "Dr. Royce S. Pitkin read excerpts from an article by Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick on the nature of democracy in schools. The point stressed here was that no man's freedom should hurt another's. It was felt that, on the whole, too much stress was being placed on the individual interest, and not on group interest. . . . The community was asked by Dr. Pitkin whether in attending classes they were primarily interested in getting individual benefits or promoting the group interest. As this idea of promoting group interest was a new one to the group, an interesting discussion resulted." ("Reasons for Skipping Classes," Note 29, p. 2)

than the surroundings (Dressel, 1969, p. 224). And indeed, one part of the Plan, designed to bring the students into contact with actual life, was directly responsible for much of the poor quality of maintenance. This unique feature of the Plan was the Work Program. The Bulletin for 1941 described its operation--the election by the Community of a Work Program Committee who planned the work and made the work assignments. The work fell into two categories--daily maintenance work in the kitchen, library, dining room; and outdoor work such as raking leaves, digging ditches, or remodeling buildings. Each student and community member was expected to devote an hour to an hour and a half each day to the program ("Program of Manual Work," 1941, p. 7). Tim remarked in 1963 that this aspect of the college had probably excited more feeling and words of anger than any other, mostly because it worked. It did bring the Goddard students into genuine working relationships with manual labor and the Vermont working men and women who were their co-workers. Such contact was to improve responsibility, enlarge the students' perspective on work, enhance their ability to work with others. He insisted that though it may have been inefficient and may have contributed to the low standards of maintenance, it did indeed, more than any other feature, promote a democratic spirit on campus. Pragmatic Tim did not refrain from adding that in that one year some $40,000 in work savings had been realized from the Work Program (Pitkin, Note 17, p. 6).

On occasion, All College Work Days, involving both students and faculty, extending this principle (Severinsen, Note 3, p. 12). And during World War II, Goddard instituted another program, Students in

Production, which arranged for three students to hold jointly one full-time job in industry, by alternating their terms on campus ("Students in Production," 1942, p. 1).

Another aspect of social concern was the community government, much of which Goddard adopted from Bennington's Plan. The Bulletin for 1941 recorded the establishment of a system of government modeled upon the New England tradition of the town meeting. In the first year of the college's existence, the students wrote a constitution "outlining the democratic structure of the community" and establishing the Community Council as the executive branch of the student government ("The College Community," 1941, p. 3). Severinsen reported a liberal definition of Community that included all students; the teaching, administrative, and maintenance staffs and their spouses. Sub-committees dealt with such issues as judiciary problems, recreation, buildings and grounds, and educational policies. The Executive Committee consisted of the President, an elected faculty member, and the chairmen of the various committees. Severinsen continued:

> The set-up has an educational background, being an attempt at assisting members in the formation of "habits of responsibility, cooperation, and democracy." But it is more than playing at democracy. First, because here all are equal. In the discussions and decisions of the community meeting everybody . . . has one vote. . . . A framework has been created inside which community members can experience democracy in action. (Severinsen, Note 3, pp. 10-11)

Although this system is very similar in concept and practice to that of Bennington, the breadth of the community at Goddard sets it somewhat apart.

The amount of control exerted by students was admired by some

and ridiculed by others. For example, the Educational Policies Committee, Severinsen recalled, at first looked to him like a terrible idea, but actually it worked very well. The committee, he said, performed responsibly and tactfully (p. 11). But Morreale wrote a scathing account of a visit from the Educational Policies Committee to an instructor at Brook Farm II (obviously Goddard College).

> In some colleges, if someone knocks on the door early in the morning, you know it's the milkman. At Brook Farm II, you can be sure it's the E.P.C. . . . Knock-Knock . . . [a small boy with a large hat] began to explain to me . . . that they were the Education Policy Committee, that they were starting an investigation, the results of which would be given to the President, who in turn, would use it when my contract came up for renewal.
>
> The girl began to takes [sic] notes, something I had never seen done at Brook Farm II--it touched me.
>
> "Is it true that you have begun to lecture in your group? . . . . Is it true that you have regimented the thought of the group by giving assignments, constricting the vision of the students by narrowing the field to simple eighteenth century history?" . . . .
>
> "If the group decides to study elephants, you go along. If it decides to adjourn, you go along. If it decides to meet at midnight, you go along." (1965, pp. 586-587)

This account may well reflect the dissatisfaction and frustration of a traditional teacher who had little empathy with the Goddard style of education, but certainly it also points out in an enlarged fashion the kinds of criticisms which were often directed at the college. However, the administrators of the college have found the system workable and it remains essentially unchanged, an important segment of education for living at Goddard.

The wider community. The original Aims (see Appendix C2) for Goddard included the integration of the life of the College with the life of the community beyond the campus. In his 1961 speech, Tim

suggested that this particular aim had not been well implemented until the middle fifties (Note 20, p. 3). However, he perhaps was overly modest. From the first, there was considerable interaction with the townspeople of Plainfield and of the surrounding communities. For one, the Work Program mingled "town and gown" effectively. Also, Elliott recalled strong social links with the community.

> People would come up for square dances, come up for the plays here, that sort of thing. I remember . . . in 1948 . . . the barber coming up with his daughters and square dancing with us. (Elliott, Note 12, p. 25)

In 1944, Tim reported that drama students, under the direction of Robert Mattuck, presented "Everyman" in three churches and a high school, extending relations with nearby communities (Pitkin, Note 30, p. 2). In another report in 1944, he noted the activities of a class in journalism, which published the Plainfield News, which covered "minor happenings in the community with the result that the members of the staff have studied Plainfield and its environs much more closely and fruitfully than before" (Pitkin, Note 31, p. 1). In 1950, the campus hosted over a thousand persons at the first annual Upper Winooski Fair, the result of inter-community planing involving the college and six neighboring communities (Pitkin, Note 32, p. 1). In these ways and in others, Goddard implemented, in its first years, the intention that "students should go out to the wider community to find out more about the problems of living and thus to learn from the non-academic world" (Pitkin, Note 17, p. 3).

In the mid-fifties, Goddard began in earnest to put into action this particular Aim by creating formal programs designed to incorporate

the society beyond the campus into the educational system. An Educational Resources Project sent Goddard students into the community classrooms, not as practice teachers, but as contributors of time and the special skills which they had developed (Beecher, 1957, pp. 130-131). The students' off-campus work was correlated with on-campus workshops to ensure that the process would be an educational one for those participating in it.

In 1957 the Comparative Cultures Program was started to combine two goals--to encourage the study of languages and to study the culture associated with the particular language. Students lived and studied and worked, for example, in French Canada. A state-wide program was developed in 1959, the Vermont Community Development Program, an adult education program in which students were also involved as assistants. In these three ways, Goddard effectively extended its campus into the wider community, promoting the college's efforts "to learn and live the great principles of democracy" by observing it in action (Pitkin, Note 33, p. 5).

Conclusions. Goddard College was committed from the first to education that linked the student with the world around him. The Aims of the college explicitly stated this as a major goal; the history of the college shows that practice was consistent with philosophy in this respect. With its unique Work Program; its informal relationships with its neighbors; its formal projects such as the Educational Resources Project, the Comparative Cultures Program, it involved students with society even beyond the college town. It has continued its progress in this direction, especially in the current Adult Degree Program

developed under Evalyn Bates (Bates, Note 19, pp. 16-21) and the Goddard Experimental Program for Further Education (Elliott, Note 12), p. 16). Both are external degree programs leading to the B.A., and are but two examples of an array of plans which draw the outside world in or exapnd the college outward.

The uniqueness upon which Goddard prides itself can be plainly seen in this area. The amount of contact provided between student and the real world was indeed unusual; the contrast with Bennington where contact outside the campus was limited, is marked. Both in theory and in fact, Goddard College exemplified the Model's consideration of education as concerned with social ends. Designed to expose the students to the world around them, to bring to life the problems and issues of the democracy as they participated in the campus democracy, the Goddard education in this respect seemed indeed most Deweyan.

Scientific teaching methods. A 1956 self-study of classroom teaching was later reported by Will Hamlin (1957). He introduced the study with a definition of Goddard's opinion of what constituted an ideal classroom:

> A good learning situation, the Goddard faculty stated, was one in which students were aided in the application of knowledge to living situations. Related factors which may be observed in the classroom include the conscious and specific use of scientific problem-solving methods as applicable to problems other than those being dealt with in class. (p. 203)

This statement could be a summary of the two aims proposed by the Model. Of interest now are the methods by which the faculty expected to achieve these goals. Suggested techniques were "logical analysis, clear or meaningful communication, and a flexible balancing of

specifics with abstractions" (p. 203). The teachers might, for example, encourage the introduction of personal experience, of matters associated with campus and community into the classroom; they might stress the importance of "cooperation, mutual respect and acceptance, and the willing subordination of individual idiosyncracies to a recognized group need" (p. 204).

This 1956 study and the Six-Year Study of Curriculum Organization that followed were concerned with teaching, with collecting scientific data on how the Goddard education could best succeed in achieving its stated goals. It was in the temper of Tim's philosophy from the first as he sought to find the most scientific appraoch to teaching and learning.

Faculty meetings were used by Tim as in-service training (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 36). They were scheduled weekly and lasted about two and a half hours. They were often long debates upon educational problems--defining good teaching, planning new methods, evaluating experiments that had been tried. "Thus, the faculty meetings became meetings of a very active and intelligent group of students of education--[the faculty]" (Severinsen, Note 3, p. 13).

Corinne Elliott recalled that faculty meetings were really seminars on education:

> There was some business conducted but essentially we talked about educational issues and very often they would be centered on a specific problem or student or set of incidents. But eventually they would work into educational philosophy and

> theory and ideas about learning. And then sometimes they would deliberately set about to be study groups. (Elliott, Note 12, pp. 5-6)[10]

Some faculty at one point (when the formation of an AAUP unit on campus was being planned) raised questions as to the need to spend more time in faculty meetings making crucial policy decisions and less time discussing the improvement of teaching methods (Chickering, Note 34, p. 3).

Will Hamlin remarked that Tim always emphasized Kilpatrick's version of Dewey: that you learn what you need to learn, that you learn in situations which demand action. In faculty meetings, he said, they often talked a lot about these views:

> So we were talking, I think, when we were talking about Dewey, first of all about education which was centered in problems or very pressing issues or questions--felt needs was one of the terms that were used. We were talking about action that is an attempt to deal with these things, and . . . a great deal about a certain kind of evaluation which is "reconstructive" in its nature. (Hamlin, Note 18, p. 9)

As already stated, the faculty had as a group studied some of Dewey's books as well. All these data indicate a strong commitment to the basic concepts that Dewey espoused as to the nature of learning and an extensive effort on Tim's part to involve his faculty with those ideas. However, training a traditional teacher to operate in the Goddard style was not always easy. Mattuck spoke of the mighty struggle that Tim and the faculty waged to find the right manner of adapting the discussion

---

[10] Beecher et. al reported faculty groups studying "Workshop Approach to Teaching," "Evaluation in the Teaching-Learning Process," "Extending the Use of Learning Aids," and "Goal Directedness and Increased Depth and Focus" (1966, p. 28).

method to the sciences.[11] Tim tried an experiment with three new science teachers by assigning them each for a term or so to observe a lecture class taught by an instructor adept in the leading of discussion groups. Mattuck recalled that he had one of the three attached to his literature course. The outcome was that "the young science fellow" fell in love with the idea of using science fiction to interest students in science and became a first class teacher (Note 1, pp. 11-12).

The emphasis upon the scientific study of learning in the forties was followed by a concern with the discussion group method of teaching in the fifties, which in turn gave way to a reliance upon the technique of independent study after the Six-Year Study found it effective for Goddard students (Hamlin, Note 35, p. 6). Another important facet of concern at Goddard was a very early interest in the psychological aspects of learning and the related concept of education of the Whole Man.

Education of the whole man. A 1978 self-study report for the New England Association of Schools and Colleges evaluated Goddard's history and identified several definite educational eras that could be observed. The earliest consisted of the first fifteen to twenty years devoted to the philosophy of education. There followed the time from the middle fifties to the mid-sixties which was more concerned with psychological aspects of education; then a time of sociological emphasis intervened, overlapping with the years where political questions

---

[11] Severinsen reported that lectures were almost banned. "An attempt from the writer of these lines at a minor lecture followed by a question period was met with considerable lack of understanding from the students who were not used to listening inactively to a teacher" (Note 3, p. 9). [Compare Morreale's complaints above.]

took the forefront ("Goddard's Past," Note 36, p. 1). However, the formal turn towards the psychological elements of education, towards accepting the responsibility for all facets of student growth, had its roots in the earliest days when Goddard was being planned and can be directly traced to Kilpatrick's version of Dewey's philosophy.

The Goddard Bulletin for 1965 spoke reverently of the Kilpatrick Conference in 1938. It had, the Bulletin claimed, "affirmed on scientific grounds something the Universalist founders of Goddard had understood intuitively"; that effective education must involve the whole person ("A Century of Liberalism," 1965, p. 50). The principles which emerged from this conference were written by Kilpatrick and included the statement that "education is a moral concern, in which intellect is understood as a function of a whole person" ("When Goddard," Note 7, p. 3). Kilpatrick wrote in 1941 that the aims of teachers must be to help students "live such lives as are fit to be built into character, such rich all-round thoughtful lives as will promise best now and henceforth . . . for all concerned ("The College Community," 1941, p. 6). It is obvious that Kilpatrick had established the basic principle from his first contacts with Goddard.

Tim himself carried on the trend. He often spoke or wrote in a similar vein, well before the fifties. In his Second Annual Report he wrote:

> It is the opinion of the faculty and corroborated by the testimony of parents that one of the spheres in which Goddard has been most successful has been in the development of personality and the correction or elimination of serious emotional difficulties. (Pitkin, Note 14, p. 2)

In 1941, he reported to the trustees that "the faculty has given a great deal of study to the emotional problems of individual students" with the help of a consulting psychologist (Pitkin, Note 37, p. 1). In 1945 he added:

> The need of our times is for men and women . . . who are more interested in the full development of human possibilities than in the making of money and things." (Pitkin, Note 38, p. 1)

Obviously, the interest in educating the whole person pervaded the college from the early days.

It was Robert Mattuck who drew the faculty attention formally to the psychological aspects of learning (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 41). Mattuck discussed the counseling system (see "Structure" below), a topic with which he was familiar, having been for 15 years the senior counselor, responsible for the whole counseling program.

> We denied it was psychotherapy--but it was fairly heavily oriented toward psychotherapy . . . Tim insisted . . . that counseling as we understood it was helping a student find himself, find herself, and to make a whole out of all the fragments. . . . It had an involvement in what used, to be glibly called the "whole student." (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 5-6)

In 1963, the Anniversary Conference on Education at Goddard met to investigate implementations of the findings of the Eight Year Study of the Progressive Education Association. The Conference was particularly interested in the relationship of personality to education. In the preface to the written report on this conference, Tim spoke of the great impact of the Study upon education and also credited a number of more recent researchers doing influential work, among them Carl Rogers, Brick Chisholm, and Lawrence Kubie. Each of these men had, as we shall see, been directly involved in Goddard's new preoccupation with the psychological (Pitkin, 1964, pp. 8-11).

Lawrence Kubie, a psychoanalyst, was an old family friend of Mattuck. Kubie had indirectly led him to Goddard (Mattuck, Note 1, p. 4). According to Elliott (Note 12, pp. 1-3) it was Kubie's graduation speech in 1953 on the forgotten man in education (self-knowledge) that aroused a flurry of interest all over the country. Tim immediately grasped the importance of this sudden interest and called a conference on the role of self-knowledge and the educative process, chaired by Brick Chisholm. This initial leap into psychoanalytical theory was followed by contacts with Carol Rogers, who was then working out his child-centered therapy.[12] Rogers later attended several conferences at Goddard at which he "talked with faculty members and others about the conditions under which individual learn" ("Education and Freedom," 1978, p. 15). Later still Maslow made additional contributions to the psychological approach to the Goddard education. The net result, Elliott felt, was good.

> What this was doing to the original Deweyan concept was making it much richer, and it was keeping abreast of current ideas and research in psychology and in education. . . . In the time that I was associated with Goddard I saw a deepening of the philosophy. (Elliott, Note 12, p. 3)

But to this observer, it seems almost more that education had finally caught up to Tim. His original concept of educating the whole person was now clothed in new and scientific terms, but at heart Goddard was still about the same business as was Kilpatrick back in the thirties. The individual in all his complexities was still the core of education.

---

[12] Rogers was one of the Committee which acted as advisors to the Goddard faculty in the 1955 study of the application of research findings in the behavioral sciences to higher education (Leveridge, Note 39, p. 1).

Conclusions. Goddard was constantly and consciously concerned with teaching methods, leaning heavily upon Kilpatrick's interpretation of Dewey. Tim involved faculty in studies of that which modern scientists and philosophers had to contribute to effective teaching. The pattern was consistent over the years; and as psychiatry and psychology took their place in the sciences, their theories and research findings were granted audience on the Plainfield campus. Dewey might well have taken exception to the strong emphasis upon the individual and the resulting de-emphasis of subject-matter content, but Goddard's scientific approach towards the improvement of teaching was indeed in the spirit of his philosophy. Conformity with the Model is here quite complete.

Structure. An often-repeated definition of curriculum at Goddard was written by George Beecher in his introduction in 1959 to the proposal for the Experiment in Curriculum Organization--Goddard's Six-Year Study that ran from 1959-1965. It read, "The curriculum is what the individual student, operating as an adult, plans and carries out to learn what he needs to learn" (Beecher et al., 1966, p. 24b). Much later (1980), he again commented upon the question of curriculum at Goddard.

> If I might reflect a bit on the Goddard we knew well up to about 1968 . . . , I can say that we had no curriculum.[13] We did not know what the question was and we didn't try to formulate requirements in academic terms . . . Still we can't say that everyone should have any prescribed study. . . . A curriculum for the unwilling is . . . at best only an illusion of freedom. (Beecher, Note 11, pp. 1-3)

---

[13] In response to Beecher's letter, Tim wrote, "Whereas he says Goddard had 'no curriculum,' I have always maintained that everything a Goddard student did constituted his or her curriculum" (Pitkin, Note 40, p. 5).

Tim recalled that the "upshot" of the first Kilpatrick Conference in 1938 was a program with no specific subject requirements for admission or graduation, no marks or credits, no examinations for instructional purposes (Pitkin, Note 10, p. 5). Unlike Bennington, however, faculty were allowed to offer courses, although they were not listed in a formal catalog. No limit was put upon the number of courses a student could take until one enterprising young man elected to carry eleven in one term. This led to one of the first restrictions --a limit of three courses in a semester. It also soon became clear that content had to be defined within broad limits. The process of a democratic selection of subject matter in the class room often resulted in what Tim called "an unhappy minority," and this constituted a real problem. Tim admitted, "We learned, I think, that you have to have a certain amount of what is now referred to as 'structure'" (Pitkin, Note 8, pp. 14-16).

The Goddard student then was expected to plan his own program and to choose those courses which fitted his/her needs. In this he was assisted by his counselor. Tim firmly stated that the final determination rested with the student, a situation in sharp contrast to that at Bennington. He believed that "the system of counseling and free election in use at Goddard [was] personal, human, and educative instead of routinized, mechanical, and stultifying (Pitkin, Note 22, p. 4).

And so once more we arrive at the question of the functioning of the counseling system, which more than any other feature of the college plan influenced the student's academic fate on campus. This issue was discussed with Will Hamlin. The interviewer summarized her own

conjectures in this fashion:

> It seems to me that what really went on here was that, although you had no course requirements for graduation, although you had no requirements to major in a special field and your emphasis was on the interests and needs of the student, there was a . . . watchfulness by the faculty . . . , using their own expertise and experiences to guide the student . . . Informally, you were doing the same sort of thing that most schools do formally--but with more flexibility. Instead of having specific course requirements, you had general ideas about what education should do for these students. You were guiding them, instead of hauling them, in that direction.

Hamlin replied, "I think that's an accurate way of saying it" (Hamlin, Note 18, p. 25).

Conclusions. Again, a conclusion is drawn resembling that arrived at for Bennington--the quality of the counseling determined the amount of structure experimenced by an individual student. A firm counselor gave firm direction; a less agressive advisor left the student essentially on his own.[14] Thus, the means for achieving the goals for a Goddard student were not clearly defined by the college. Success rested upon the efficiency of the counseling system.[15] The Model suggested specific course requirements as means to the chosen ends defined by the philosophy of the college. Goddard chose a different system,

---

[14]Tim said, "I believe the experience of Goddard students has shown that when students build their program of study on their interests, their objectives and their problems, they learn rapidly and well. Nevertheless, we have to say that free choice--even when accompanied by the best counseling we can provide--does not assure high academic performance" (Pitkin, Note 17, p. 4).

[15]Hamlin felt that the small size of the college in the early days worked to prevent "individualistic good counseling, bad counselling." When everyone knew everyone else, when faculty meetings (Goddard style) were held weekly, the exchange of information was extensive and thus errors or deficiencies in counseling were quickly public property. This helped to minimize this type of problem (Hamlin, Note 18, pp. 15-16).

one quite far removed from the proposal of the Model.

Specialization. The discussions above of the educational plan and of structure indicate a general dearth of requirements. There was as well no direct regulation which specified that a student should declare a major, such as the Trial Major at Bennington. However, when the conclusion that students did not in practice specialize was presented to former faculty members, there was an unanimous disagreement.

> Question: Did you require specialization?
>
> Tim: Not in the usual sense, but I think, with one or two exceptions, that practically every student that graduates does develop a special concentration . . . When they come to be admitted to what we call the Senior Division, they have to indicate the area in which they want to concentrate. Now we would think there would be some who would say, "What I want to do is simply extend my general education." But relatively few kids ever do that; most of them want to dig in deeply in drama, or science or language, something of that sort. (Pitkin, Note 8, p. 31)
>
> Question: In my Model, I propose that Dewey would insist that each student should specialize in something. I don't mean narrowly specialize . . . , but should get into some subject in depth. Would you agree with that?
>
> Mattuck: Yes, but I want to spell that out along these lines. First of all, when a student approaches a problem, and accepts it and starts dealing with it in the way we're talking about, he is in it in depth. He's not skating over the surface of it. The second thing is, I think we've got to be careful of depth as a synonym for narrow specialization . . . But we have very little of that. One of the proofs of the pudding . . . [is] our Senior Studies . . . , upon which [students devote] anywhere from a full term to a full year . . . tackling a problem, . . . one they are interested in. (Mattuck, Note 1, pp. 16-18)
>
> Interviewer: I am quite interested in the idea of specialization, working on Dewey's thinking about the continuity of experience, how inquiry is a spiral [process].

Hamlin: We certainly relied very heavily on the counseling role to deal with a great many things, one of which was that of continuity (p. 12).

[Specialization at Goddard is not in] an area; it's a problem. One of our requirements . . . in our undergraduate program is that there be done a major Senior Study. That amounts to really a requirement [that] you specialize; at least to be able to define a problem or a question, and bring all of your resources for at least a full semester or a full year to bear on that problem or question. [This] necessarily demands a certain degree of specialization (Hamlin, Note 18, pp. 22-23).

Elliott: (Still Director of the Records Office): In most colleges, you take a sprinkling of courses in a number of fields the first two years and then the last two years concentrate on something. Theoretically that was our thing too, because we were working towards . . . an independent study project in the final semester to which he devoted all of his/her time--the culmination of the work at Goddard . . . That was seen as probably a very specialized area. . . . What would happen is that they would get very specialized at first and then find that they really needed to know more about other things. (Elliott, Note 12, pp. 12-13)

In 1958, George Beecher presented to the faculty his ideas upon this subject, or at least, one aspect of the issue.

Colleges, with the scourging of Hutchins, have hated to think of commitment in terms of anything vocational. They have emphasised liberal arts and general education. This is what I think violates the aim of individual worth . . . The colleges could do better to show that the adult status is harmonious both the work and with intellect. A college student would do well to make the commitment to any of the lines of work which need higher education and to begin at once as an apprentice. (Beecher et. al, 1966, p. 22)

However, a note in a different tone came from Severinsen, who came to Goddard from the background of the Danish folk schools.

At a time when the pass-word is specialization, and in a country whose leading business men almost frantically, facing competition from the Soviet Union, repeat this word over and over again, there is still room for a college whose stated objective is nothing more specialized than "to help students work, think, and live as independent, responsible, constructive, creative, and adult members of an interdependent society." No more--and no less. (Severinsen, Note 3, p. 7)

Conclusions. Apparently, most faculty at Goddard felt that the usual student, through the entrance requirements of the Senior Division, the demands of the Senior Study, the pursuit of vocational goals or of individual interests would inevitably concentrate to some extent. However, this would most likely not be in an area such as Chemistry. It would more probably be a concentration upon a particular problem to be solved, which might, and should, lead to a broadening of experience. This definition of specialization, however, seems itself to be rather specialized. It does not imply, as does the Model, a progressive organization of subject matter over the college years. The Senior Study appears as a sort of "point" experience. For one term, a student engages to consider a particular problem. S/he may indeed have done intensive research upon this problem, but unless there were careful controls the process may have been ineffectual in gaining for the student an in-depth understanding of the principles and concepts inherent in some area of human knowledge. In addition, the timing of the concentration, at the very end of the student's education, defeats Dewey's goal of a progressive deepening of understanding, of one inquiry building upon another. And once again, the point is reached where the conclusion must be that, although some students, perhaps even many, gained a thorough understanding in an area, unless the counseling system was operating efficiently in the supervision of the Senior Study or in alternate routes, there was no assurance that each student would achieve this goal. The Model's insistence upon specialization as an end and upon suitable means designed to accomplish this end was absent at Goddard.

The experimental college. The Rutland Daily Herald interviewed Tim in January of 1968, a time close to the end of the Pitkin era at Goddard. Tim talked about the role of the experimental college in a world of change.

> An experimental college, according to the Vermont College experimenter of more than 30 years, should be continually in the process of change. It should create a better climate for learning and a better climate for self education. It should be able to keep the faith, continue to be experimental and change because conditions change . . . To experiment, he said, is to look at a problem, establish a hypothesis, and develop a scheme for testing. Then go ahead and test. (Bergman, 1968)

Talk. For years, Tim had been talking in this vein, showing his dedication to the experimental in education; using, as did Dewey, the scientific method in a conscious fashion. The literature of Goddard provided abundant illustration of this concern for experimentation. Tim, in 1944, described unique courses such as Factors in Design and Construction of Costume, Folk Music, Upper Winooski Valley Biology, Changing Governments and Cultures. Courses such as these gave, he said, expression to the experimental character of the college (Pitkin, Note 30, pp. 1-2). The 1959 pamphlet, "Rebuilding a Curriculum," read in part:

> [Goddard] was set up as an experimental institution to work out ways of educating individuals in a world where change is the only universal. Its basic hypothesis was that teachers and students can work together in making and carrying out an effective curriculum. . . . The experiment here described [An Experiment in Curriculum Organization] is one specific implementation of that large hypothesis. ("Rebuilding, Note 13, p. 3) [Underlining added.]

> [Goddard] is a college that recognizes the rapidity of social, economic and political change. It recognizes also the need for constant and continuing educational research and experimentation. (Pitkin, Note 41, p. 14)

> For the teacher . . . the Goddard philosophy requires . . . an eagerness to engage in educational experimentation based on carefully formulated hypotheses regarding the conditions of learning. (Beecher et al., 1966, p. 4) [Underlining added.]
>
> It is about time that we formulated new hypotheses about the ways in which education takes place and devised models for testing these and older hypotheses. (Pitkin, Note 42, p. 11)

Scott wrote, in his case study of Goddard, that Goddard from the beginning was experimentally oriented and expected both faculty and student to be experimentally minded (Scott, 1966, p. 89). In 1978, Hamlin echoed this thought, defining as one of the continuing traditions of Goddard the concept of an experimental college, pioneering in new forms of undergraduate and graduate study ("Goddard's Past," Note 36, p. 1).

Action. Hamlin's claim that Goddard did indeed implement its rhetoric can be substantiated. In "Scientific Teaching Methods" above, it was pointed out that the faculty meetings often served as occasions for evaluation of experiments in teaching at Goddard. Curriculum in the earliest years reflected the experimental approach, as indicated above. There was also an insistence upon constant self-evaluation by faculty and student alike, an integral feature of the Goddard life which was in effect a continual process of testing the educational experiments underway.

Students, for example, were expected to participate in the evaluation of their own progress. Corinne Elliott discussed this expectation:

> Evaluation is our catch-word around here. You evaluate everything you do. You plan something; you carry out the plan; and then you evaluate it. We'd always said that oral evaluation is probably the most effective . . . because the student

> and the instructor and the counselor . . . are giving each other instant feedback. You [the student] can change your behavior immediately and do something about it rather than wait until the end of the semester . . . But we said it is also important to have the written. (Elliott, Note 12, p. 18)

Tim also spoke about evaluation:

> Each student at the end of a semester wrote an evaluation of what he or she had done and then--at the very beginning, the faculty member wrote one too, independently of the student--and they got together and talked about it. [After the Experiment in Curriculum Organization], there developed the notion that the student should write their own evaluations, and then the faculty would react to that evaluation . . . [I would] meet with students and ask for a written evaluation and talk about it. And then . . . I would write an evaluation while the student was there. (Pitkin, Note 10, pp. 11-12)

Such processes put the students' self-evaluations into the experimental framework, since at the beginning of the semester, they were required to write a description of their individual aims and the proposed means for achieving those aims. The final evaluation then was the last step in that semester's academic experiment.

Faculty and administration were similarly engaged in experimental testing of their endeavors; in evaluation of their larger experiments in education. Tim placed the date of the first evaluation of the Goddard program at the end of the first semester--the Conference of 1939 chaired again by Kilpatrick (Pitkin, Note 8, p. 4). Another early example of formal evaluation was a study recommended by Tim in 1941. He felt that the end of the first three years was a fitting time at which to look at the functioning of the college. This was done by a committee of trustees at the end of that year (Pitkin, Note 37, p. 6; Note 43, p. 3). The entire faculty joined in another study in 1956, redefining the objectives of the college and examining how effective

the Goddard plan was in realizing those objectives (Hamlin, 1957, p. 1). At the conclusion of this effort, Tim proposed revisions to the curriculum, expecting the faculty to evaluate them. He suggested that "a further requirement would be periodic appraisal. . . . so that the entire college curriculum would be in constant revision" ("Rebuilding," Note 13, p. 7). There followed the Six-Year Study, the "Experiment in Curriculum Organization," which set as one of its goals the defining of means for improved evaluation of the students' program, and so by inference, the program of the college (Beecher et al., 1966, p. 24c).

The seriousness of Goddard's concern can also be seen in the establishment of positions to carry out research and evaluation, such as Director of Research in 1939, which was Dr. Mattuck's first title ("Mattuck Appointed," Note 44, p. 1); Director of Research and Experimentation, a position held for some time by George Beecher, but no longer in existence (Hamlin, Note 18, p. 6); Director of Faculty Studies, Don Leveridge (Leveridge, Note 39, p. 1); Coordinator of Evaluation, Arthur Chickering; and later still, Director of Evaluations, Will Hamlin (Note 18, p. 5). Money was persistently spent out of a chronically tight budget to carry out this continuing process of evaluation. This sort of activity has continued; in 1974 Lynne Terry, Special Researcher, conducted yet another evaluative survey, this time of graduates of the Resident Undergraduate Program ("Results," Note 45).

Many other examples are available to illustrate the evaluative aspects of the experimental nature of Goddard. Their experimental

approach to curriculum and to teaching have been presented in other sections of this paper, a small sample of those reported over the years. Hamlin collected a brief history of education at Goddard and filled two pages with the detail of new programs, built upon past experimentation at Goddard ("Goddard's Past," Note 36, pp. 5-6). The literature of Goddard is pervaded with references to its experimental nature in many phases of its program.

Conclusions. From all viewpoints, there is consistent evidence that Goddard considered itself to be an experimental college and did conduct itself accordingly. It successfully coped with pressures such as those reported at Bennington by President Fels, who claimed that alumni insisted that the President was "to see that Bennington does not change in any respect and to see that it remains an experimental college" ("Goddard at 25," 1963, p. 89). Tim has further quoted Fels as saying: "Bennington was an experiment, whereas Goddard was an experimental college . . . It took 50 years to test the experiment at Bennington" (Pitkin, Note 8, p. 10). Tim also wrote, "Goddard is not a college that has arrived, but rather a college that is evolving" (Pitkin, Note 41, p. 15). Perhaps the comparison of this attitude to that expressed by President Leigh in 1958 epitomizes the great difference between these sister colleges. At that time, President Leigh said, as reported above, "Bennington is no longer an experiment--it is a time-tested and proven way of college life."

Summary and Conclusions

Goddard College, a Johnny-Come-Lately to the progressive movement in higher education, has faced an uphill battle all throughout its history. Rather precipitiously reborn from the dying Universalist-based Goddard Seminary, it physically relocated to a large farm estate in 1938. Remodeling barns and outbuildings into classroom and dining halls, it clung to life and its Vermont hillsides tenaciously, despite financial problems so severe that on several occasions faculty went without salary.[16] Never achieving the grace and polish of Bennington, which had served in many respects as its model, it did however establish for itself a unique, if precarious, position as an experimental college. For more than thirty years, Dr. Royce Pitkin, "Tim" to all, dedicated his efforts and those of his faculty to this Vermont School for Living, where students educated themselves for real life through facing real problems. The philosophy was strongly based upon Kilpatrick's interpretation of Dewey; it is reported that Kilpatrick was pleased with Tim's implementation of his ideas.

---

[16]Tim reminisced, "We were always under great stress financially and the hardest thing for me was to have to tell the faculty that we haven't got the money to meet the payroll" (Pitkin, Note 10, p. 34). His Report in 1939 noted that contributions of faculty to the $7,000 deficit amounted to $3,300 (Note 9, p. 3). In 1942, he reported individual voluntary salary reductions of $802, requested by Evalyn Bates and Helen and Royce Pitkin (Note 15, p. 4). The 1944 Report showed that the unpaid salary account ($5,187 in 1942) was reduced to $1,765.22 in 1943, and paid completely in 1944 (Note 30, p. 6). In the fifties, salaries were suspended, this time for three months, and debenture bonds issued instead. Elliott recalled, "That was a trial by fire. In the early days, I think people worked for peanuts. I think there was even some kind of bartering going on, goods instead of salary. . . . People came here because they were committed to this kind of education" (Elliott, Note 12, pp. 23-24).

There was as well much about Goddard which would have pleased Dewey. The Vermont School for Living, while placing emphasis upon individual worth, gave equal weight to the social aspects of education. Education, as Kilpatrick proclaimed, was life, and accordingly, Goddard students stretched the concept of classroom to encompass the community around them. A student at Goddard often found that this campus course work led him into the wider world through activities such as surveys, research, service in the public schools, assistance in community projects--numerous ways devised to involve each Goddard scholar with his/her Vermont neighbors. The Work Plan, one of the few compulsory activities on the campus, set each individual to mowing lawns or cooking meals alongside the native Vermonter--probably an education in itself for the upper-middle class youth of Goddard, and probably so conceived by Tim. The Non-Resident Term was similarly expected to expose the student to the larger world outside. Community government and the style of teaching itself, making extensive use of group discussion and group work, were both part of the implementation of the controlling principles which held that learning was living, was best done in a social setting, was to be concerned with social goals.

A second facet of Goddard's philosophy that was close to Dewey's thinking was the concern with the experimental approach to education, using the scientific method of making plans, devising means (hypotheses), putting ideas into action, and then evaluating. Students were expected to plan their own education in this fashion; faculty were encouraged to design their courses thusly; administration looked upon curriculum accordingly. Evaluation of this experimental education was

carried out by faculty informally continually, and formal studies were done at various times, by faculty and by external evaluators.

A closely related feature apparent at Goddard was the impact of Tim's general emphasis upon scientific method. It is curious (to borrow one of Tim's favorite expressions), given his obvious penchant for attacking problems in the scientific mode, that he did not formally incorporate this idea into the curriculum; he did not establish reflective thinking as a major goal. The data show that he made clear to faculty his concern with this issue, that he indicated to students that he expected them to plan their education, their Senior Project, using the methods of science; yet there was no direct acknowledgement of the development of reflective thought as a primary aim in the Goddard plan. It may well be that this idea was assumed by Tim, a former science teacher, as a postulate so basic that it need not be formalized. He told this observer that "in an experimental college, you have to apply the scientific method, but my guess is that most teachers are not conscious of that. They don't think much about it; they just go ahead and do it" (Pitkin, Note 8, p. 34). The result was that the pervasiveness of Tim's attitudes, the continual appearance of the concept in his speeches and publications, may have exposed students informally to the process of scientific problem-solving. For some, the Senior Project provided a practical experience as well. But a formal goal that all students should learn reflective thinking, with carefully designed means to that end, was absent. It would seem that a Deweyan educator would not have left that important segment of education to the vagaries of the informal contribution of the educational practice.

Perhaps this lack of a formal charge to teach reflective thinking can be related, as at Bennington, to the constraints of Goddard's position on individual freedom. If the progressive college has defined freedom as the absence of curricular restrictions, it is fated to lose direct means of achieving its goals. However, Zerby strongly objected to such a definition of freedom. He believed that at Goddard, freedom was defined as the capacity of a person to control his/her own life. He also felt that there was at Goddard a structure deliberately planned to allow and assist the student to gain that control. Structure was not in the form of prescribed courses, but in the absolute requirement that the student meet his counselor for a hour every week. That was, he felt, not an informal requirement at all, but "It was an insistence." In Deweyan terms, he is quite correct. Goddard had ideas of what education should accomplish; it established the structure it thought effective. Beyond that, it was also in Deweyan style "committed to reexamining the structures continually--they are always changing" (Zerby, Note 28, p. 23).

Dewey, of course, would never have considered that good education would wear a single coat. Institutions with countless varieties of emphases, students or techniques could fall into the Deweyan mode. But whatever the focus, the Deweyan elements of education must occupy a frontal position. Inquiry with social goals must be central.

One might then examine Goddard, the closest of the sample colleges to a Deweyan college, with the question--What would it take to make it thoroughly Deweyan? The social emphasis is there; the experimental tendency is obvious. There was structure of a kind that made

good sense to Goddard. But had Tim only placed inquiry as a fundamental goal, had he given the scientific the same importance in the philosophy of the college that he did in his own practice of education, then structure would have been automatically defined in a manner more consonant with the Model.

What prevented Tim from giving reflective thought a Deweyan eminence? One can only surmise, but two possibilities can be suggested. One, the pattern for progressive education at the college level had already been set by the other colleges in the sample. In each of these, the individual reigned supreme. The development of the student's potential was the essential goal. Goddard was planned to implement all that was good in the "new" education and followed closely in their tracks. Second, the influence of Kilpatrick must be invoked. Reading again his guiding principles for the college, one notes the absence of any mention of reflective thought (see Appendix C1). Instead, the concept of education as a psychological process, a moral concern with the whole person emerges. This emphasis upon education of the whole person, directed towards real life, promoted very Deweyan social goals; but it negated the role of science and its methods in developing the powers of the individual to control his/her own life. Insistence upon a properly taught science course could be a simple pathway to the promotion of reflective thought. Goddard denied itself this route and indeed, neglected science in a rather grand manner. Dewey believed that every citizen should have a sound knowledge of both the principles and the power of science. Data indicating that Goddard students obtained this knowledge and insight are lacking.

On balance, however, one must conclude that Goddard incorporated much of Dewey's philosophy. Although much less structured than the Deweyan College of the Model, it has given serious attention in some form to the two major goals of the Model. Whether or not, in this quite structureless system, the majority of students designed their education in such a fashion as to provide a Deweyan education could well be a fruitful and illuminating topic for further research.

Reference Notes

1. Mattuck, R. Personal interview, June 3, 1980.

2. Pitkin, R. A plan for securing wider understanding and support for Goddard College. Typewritten, Goddard College, October 17, 1949. (In a notebook with the President's Reports)

3. Severinsen, H. Unscientific report on a year of teaching and learning in the U.S. of A. Typewritten, Goddard College, 1962.

4. Martineau, P. From chaos to order. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1955. Also published in Library Journal, 1955, 80, 1183-1186.

5. Barnes, K. Student publications at Goddard College. Esperance, Fall 1962, pp. 7-11. Mimeographed.

6. Salisbury, D. They builded better than they knew: The Universalist church and its concern for education. Boston: Association of Universalist Women, 1957. Typewritten.

7. When Goddard Seminary. Typewritten, Goddard College, not dated, but around 1963. A brief history from the files of Will Hamlin.

8. Pitkin, R. Personal interview, June 4, 1980.

9. Pitkin, R. Report of the President for the quarter ending April 22, 1939. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1939.

10. Pitkin, R. Interview with Russell Tiberii, 1979.

11. Beecher, G. Letter published in The Philosophy Motion, May 18, 1980, 1-3. Mimeographed, Empire State College, 1980.

12. Elliott, C. Personal interview, June 4, 1980.

13. Rebuilding a curriculum. Goddard College, undated. (Apparently a pamphlet printed by the college)

14. Pitkin, R. Second annual report of the President of Goddard College, July 6, 1940. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1940.

15. Pitkin, R. Report of the President for the year ending June 30, 1942. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1942.

16. Fall 1961 mid-semester conference on "Goals and practices in college education." Esperance, Fall 1961, pp. 2-4. Mimeographed.

17. Pitkin, R. Twenty five years of educational experimentation: An autobiographical disquisition. Typewritten, Goddard College, June 17, 1963. A talk at the final meeting of the community for the year.

18. Hamlin, W. Personal interview, July 8, 1980.

19. Bates, E. Personal interview, June 4, 1980.

20. Pitkin, R. The Goddard College philosophy. Typewritten, Goddard College, October 26, 1961.

21. Pitkin, R. Ninth annual report of the President of Goddard College. Mimeographed, Goddard College, June 30, 1947.

22. Pitkin, R. Report of the President, September 30, 1946. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1946.

23. Boris, M. Aspects of science at Goddard: A molecular view. Esperance, Spring 1963, 6-8.

24. Niemtzow, R. Scientific studies at Goddard College. Unpublished Senior Study, Goddard College, 1966.

25. McCauley, R. Course review: Wildlife 14. Typewritten, Goddard College, 1940.

26. Pierce, J. Course review: General chemistry. Typewritten, Goddard College, 1948.

27. Pierce, J. Course review: Organic chemistry. Typewritten, Goddard College, Fall 1948.

28. Zerby, C. Personal interview, October, 1980.

29. Reasons stated for skipping classes. Goddard Record, March 7, 1939, 1-2.

30. Pitkin, R. Report of the President of Goddard College for the year ending June 30, 1944. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1944.

31. Pitkin, R. Report of the President of Goddard College for the quarter ending December 31, 1944. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1944.

32. Pitkin, R. Ventures in inter-community cooperation. Reprinted from Childhood Education, March 1952.

33. Pitkin, R. Report of the President of Goddard College for the year ending June 30, 1943. Typewritten, Goddard College, 1943.

34. Chickering, J. Is the AAUP necessary? Esperance, 1961, pp. 2-5.

35. Hamlin, W. Goddard College: Retrospect and prospect. Mimeographed, Files of W. Hamlin, Goddard College, 1973-1974. A report of a self-study of the college.

36. Goddard's Past, Present, and Future. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1978. A self-study report for the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, 1977-1978. Wilfred Hamlin, project director.

37. Pitkin, R. Report of the President: Quarterly meeting: Board of trustees of Goddard College Corporation. Mimeographed, Goddard College, April 5, 1941.

38. Pitkin, R. Report of the President of Goddard College for the quarter ending December 31, 1945. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1945.

39. Leveridge, D. The college as a laboratory for applying findings and methods of the behavioral sciences. Mimeographed, Files of W. Hamlin, Goddard College, 1955.

40. Pitkin, R. Letter published in The Philosophy Motion, May 18, 1980, pp. 4-5. Mimeographed, Empire State College.

41. Pitkin, R. Report of the President, September 1960. Reprinted in Severinsen, H. Unscientific report of a year of teaching and learning in the U.S. of A. Typewritten, Goddard College, 1962, p. 14.

42. Pitkin, R. It's about time. Goddard Journal, Summer 1969, pp. 10-11.

43. Pitkin, R. Report of the President of Goddard College for the year ending June 30, 1941. Mimeographed, Goddard College, 1941.

44. Mattuck appointed to post here. Goddard Record, March 3, 1939, pp. 1-2. Mimeographed.

45. Terry, L. Results of 1974 RUP alumni survey. Unpublished report, Goddard College, 1976. Mimeographed.

Reference List

Beecher, G. Educational resources project. School and society, April 13, 1957, pp. 130-131.

Beecher, G., Chickering, A., & Pitkin, R. An experiment in college curriculum organization. Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1966. Mimeographed, also available at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Bennington College, Bennington College Bulletin, 1932-33, pp. 3-19.

Bergman, V. Vermonter in Washington. Rutland Daily Herald, January 27, 1968. Reprint, Goddard College, no page numbers.

A century of liberalism. The Goddard Bulletin, 1965, 30(4), pp. 49-52.

Chickering, A. Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971. (Originally published, 1969.)

The college community. The Goddard Bulletin, January 1941, pp. 1-6.

Dewey, J. As quoted in Beecher, G., Chickering, A., & Pitkin, R. An experiment in college curriculum organization. Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1966. Mimeographed.

Dressel, P. Goddard College. In M. Keeton & C. Hilberry (Eds.), Struggle and promise; a future for colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969, pp. 217-238.

Education and freedom. The Goddard Bulletin, March 1971, pp. 3-29.

The educational plan. The Goddard Bulletin, March, 1939, pp. 1-31.

Goddard at 25. Newsweek, April 8, 1963, pp. 88-89.

The Goddard Bulletin. Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1965.

Hamlin, W. A college faculty looks at itself. Reprinted from The Journal of Higher Education, 1957, 28(4), pp. 202-207.

Is college just a place to do time? Harper's Weekly, April 19, 1976, pp. 9-11; 14-15.

Morreale, B. Brook Farm II: A memoir. Antioch Review, Winter 1965-66, pp. 577-591.

Pitkin, R. Foreword. In W. Hamlin (Ed.), Teacher, school, and child. Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1964.

Program of manual work. The Goddard Bulletin, January, 1941, pp. 6-7.

Scott, D. Small colleges in transition. Unpublished dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.

Students in production. The Goddard Bulletin, January, 1942, pp. 1-2.

What Goddard stands for. The Goddard Bulletin, January, 1941, pp. 5-6.

What students study. The Goddard Bulletin, 1965, 30(4), p. 48.

C H A P T E R VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND SPECULATIONS

This chapter will summarize the findings of the research and present three major conclusions derived from the data. It will present an overview of the role of the sample colleges in the educational endeavors of their times.

Summary of Findings

The Table below (page 319) summarizes the findings of this study and simplifies comparisons among the colleges of the sample. It is clear, looking at the data so collected, that there was no one college which conformed in all respects with the Model. In fact at none of the colleges except at Goddard was there found a major aim consonant with those of the Model--the development of the power of reflective thinking and education with social goals. Goddard did incorporate social goals for education in its aims, but failed, as did the other three schools, to accord to reflective thinking the status of a major aim. It is then not surprising that most of the characteristics of a Deweyan College were also absent, since they were derivative of the proposed aims. The conclusions may be fairly drawn that the progressive colleges in the sample, when evaluated against the Model, could not be classified as Deweyan in nature. Of the four, Sarah Lawrence was rated as conforming least to the Model, Goddard as the one most Deweyan in character.

TABLE

RESULTS OF COMPARISON WITH THE MODEL

MODEL	S.L.	BENNINGTON	BARD	GODDARD
Reflective thinking				
Aims:	-	-	-	-
Practices:				
Science	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	?-
Social Goals				
Aims:	-	-	-	+
Practices:	-	-	-	+
Scientific teaching methods	+	+	+	+
Structure	-	-	-	-
Specialization	-	+	+	?-
Experimental				
Aims	?+	?+	?+	?+
Practices	-	?+	-	+

(?-) indicates "no, but . . . "

(?+) indicates "yes, but . . . "

Bennington and Bard occupied similar intermediate positions.

The classification above is of course dependent not only on the rather inflexible ratings of the Table, but also upon more refined deductions drawn from the data. A brief discussion of the findings and of the observed trends in each category serves to lend support to the statements made above.

Reflective thinking as a major goal. At none of the colleges was there any philosophical interest in establishing inquiry as a major goal. Furthermore, at none was there extensive use made of science to provide students with exposure to the methods of science. Nor was there general emphasis upon inquiry in other areas. At Sarah Lawrence there was a definite bias against the scientific method, at Goddard a practical dedication to it, not in the curriculum but in the habitual thinking about the educational experience by President Pitkin and his faculty and staff. Between these two extremes Bennington and Bard fell in a moderate zone, giving reflective thinking little conscious attention in curriculum or in philosophy.

The social goals of education. The social goals of Dewey and of the Model were, except at Goddard, given little priority at these colleges. The trend was again from Sarah Lawrence--largely elitist, concerned with the enhancement of the quality of the leisured life its graduates anticipated, to the other extreme, Goddard. The Vermont School for Living defined for itself a social goal and experimented in many ways to make it a reality. It involved students by a variety of techniques in the life of the town and the larger community. Bennington and Bard

were, however, fixed in the determination to provide progressive education a forum in higher education and thus focused upon the individual and his/her education for life. This focus served to limit the educational plan, which was then essentially dedicated to the fulfillment of the student's potential in order that s/he might have a full life. This goal in itself would be acceptable to Dewey, but without its Deweyan corollary, the responsibility of the individual to the society, it became an active agent in promulgating other practices in opposition to Dewey's philosophy. This intense concentration upon the individual as the center and the end of education was an inward-turning concept quite different from Dewey's outward-bound philosophy.

The characteristics. Dewey's philosophy was the basis for the proposed characteristics of the College of the Model. Holding the two Aims it did for education, the College logically could be expected to evidence the particular practices delineated in the Model. Since the colleges of the sample had, with one exception, other concepts of education--other aims, they might well be expected to take forms quite dissimilar to that of the Model. Yet one might entertain the notion that their practices belied their philosophies, that they might in actuality indeed be educating their students in Deweyan classrooms. In that spirit, examination of their characteristics in an empirical as well as a philosophical sense was an essential step.

Scientific teaching methods. All four colleges used methods of instruction similar to those proposed and practiced by Dewey. All rejected lectures, recitations, large classes, exminations and

competitive grading. Each of the colleges turned instead towards the seminar approach with its emphasis upon conjoint activities such as group projects and discussion sessions. They incorporated individual and independent work as a major component of eudcation as well. The intent was to involve the student actively in his/her own education. An emphasis upon the need for the individual to be the focus of his/her own education was an invariable element of the progressive education offered by these colleges. All of these techniques are consistent with the specifications of the Model which says "attention is given to the individuality, interest and experience of the student," requiring activity by both learner and teacher. A further requirement of the Model is that new developments in the science of education be considered. All the sample colleges proposed to apply new scientific findings to pedagogy.

In this area was found the highest correlation to the Model. Yet a more detailed examination of the philosophy underlying these practices reveals a substantial divergence from Deweyan philosophy giving rise to other practices directly in opposition to the Model. That these colleges exhibited compliance with the Model in this area must be interpreted as merely coincidental, rather than as symptomatic of a Deweyan philosophical bent. A fuller analysis of this overlap of a progressive and a Deweyan education is pursued later in this chapter.

Structure in curriculum. Dewey conceived of inquiry as a spiraling process, not as a solitary event. Education, it then followed, must proceed in a sequential manner in order that deepening of the power of inquiry be effected. Balance and continuity, he proposed,

allow the process of inquiry to attain levels beyond the superficial, to approach the best thinking done by man--scientific thought. Without such safeguards education fails to fulfill the great potential with which he endowed it. Dewey was also convinced that the knowledge and experience of the adult represented the "rich fruitage" of prior inquiry which should be used to direct the inquiry of the young. Balance and continuity at the Laboratory School and at the College of the Model were conserved by curriculum expectations planned by faculty and administration. But the four colleges of the sample chose to place this curriculum responsibility upon the student. With the assistance of a counselor s/he built an individualized curriculum around personal interests and needs. This was a general characteristic of all four colleges. Some variation was observed in the amount of power vested in the counselor, but in effect the advisory system was exactly that, advisory.

The extent to which a student then succeeded in constructing a balanced program of studies with a progressive organization of subject matter such as that Dewey specified became a function of his/her own wisdom, the quality of the counseling received, or just plain luck. There was no required core of courses and in fact at most of the colleges most of the time not even a required course. Dewey's concern with structure was ousted by a cheerful optimism and a joyous faith in the natural wisdom of the student.

The need for specialization. The Model called for specialization--a deepening of inquiry by the pursuit of an area in depth. A great diversity was seen here. Sarah Lawrence required no major at

all. Nor did Goddard, although President Pitkin said that few graduates failed to concentrate in some area. Both Bennington and Bard however stressed the Four-Year major for reasons quite in contrast to Dewey's. This topic was subjected to closer examination in the Bard chapter.

It was pointed out that at these two institutions admission policies gave preference to those applicants who already showed proven abilities in a specialized field. The argument was made by these colleges that the immediate choice of a major upon entrance allowed each student to continue his/her progress in the chosen field without inefficient curriculum groping. Although both schools also outlined exploratory routes, the general practice was the enrollment in and completion of a four-year major. Faculty and administration were dedicated to encouraging this interest, to protecting it from interruption.

Several aspects of this concept of specialization were criticized. The early fixation in a major reduced the experimental and exploratory role of education that Dewey held as a primary function and in effect constricted the individual educational process. An associated avoidance of direction and restriction assumed the student's innate ability to make his/her own curriculum decisions, suggesting a Romantic philosophy at work. It was also proposed that such a prevailing policy with its stifling effect upon the experimental nature of education played an important role in creating a general atmosphere that encouraged the static nature of the educational plans that was observable at these colleges.

In summary, it is concluded that at none of these progressive

colleges was specialization practiced in the light of a Deweyan philosophy.

The experimental college. Each of the colleges prided itself upon the experimental nature of its program. However the data clearly indicate that in spite of a firm determination that each would be a bright new experiment in education, their goals were only partially realized. At Sarah Lawrence the "new" education was installed upon campus under President Warren's direction. Little change took place over the enusing decade. At Bard Tewksbury's plan was in similar fashion implemented and underwent scant modification. At neither of these schools was there evidence of planning accompanied by built-in evaluative processes, implementation, testing, and then replanning. At Bennington there was apparent a concern to evaluate the educational program as it proceeded; numerous studies were done to achieve this end. But in essence, there was only the one experiment which, its president once said, lasted for fifty years, in effect no experiment at all. Only at Goddard did there appear to be a genuine experimental approach to education. Although the underlying philosophy remained essentially constant, the faculty and administration seemed involved in a true experimental process. Unfortunately this fact may well have been its undoing. Zerby commented that "you can't really do significant educational experimentation and be respectable, no way around it" (Note 1). At this writing Goddard has (again) lost its accreditation and seems destined to close.

The implications of Zerby's charge have some alarming aspects. For Dewey the only true education was that experimentally based. If

indeed such an education can not attain respectability, then Dewey's educational philosophy can never be effectively implemented on any large scale. Zerby's further comments on this matter were examined. The trouble lay, he explained, in a failure to communicate outside of Goddard what it was all about, a failure he felt could be overcome.

> Faculty, even faculty, that you would assume were sympathetic to progressive education, are not willing to pay the price.[1] It's as simple as that. They want to have it both ways. The students do too. Students come into an experimental institution and they want to be part of an experimental place. They also want to come out with a respectable degree. . . . You can't be Deweyan and be respectable. (Note 1, p. 21)

Apparently public image and a public regard for the Goddard education were large factors in Zerby's concern. According to him, Tim (President Pitkin) resisted all arguments that said:

> "Look, we've got to have a degree that stands for something" . . . Now if you ever said "standards" to Tim he went straight through the roof. While I was a student anyway, the only time that a student would be told that he couldn't come back would be if he were clearly a mental case. That was really literally the case. (p. 11)

This did not mean that Tim did not have standards of excellence in mind for his college, but it did mean that he consistently refused to allow traditional concepts to shape his educational practices and define the Goddard education. He for one was willing to pay the price. But low enrollments over the years may have been due to an unwillingness on the part of prospective students to do likewise. An experimental education might intrigue them, but they also wished a degree

---

[1] At the Bard Symposium in 1952, Esther Rauschenbush, Dean of Sarah Lawrence, addressed the student body. She too warned them: "The main thing to be said . . . is that you have to accept the implications of your educational philosophy" (Rauschenbush, Note 2, p. 6).

that would grant them recognition.

The question then is not whether Goddard's academic program was sound; it is the question of how its education was perceived. Even the most recent loss of accreditation was upon financial not academic grounds. It is suggested that the financial situation may have been largely responsible for the public image of the college.

It is true that of all the colleges surveyed, Goddard was the most innovative, the least static. But this fact may not have been the key issue. It was also the only college which began operation with absolutely no funding, owning no grounds or buildings. It had no gift of a mountain or of a luxurious summer estate in wealthy Westchester County. Its only capital over the years was Tim's idea of an education for life, a School for Living. As a result, it never acquired the polish or elegance of Bennington or Sarah Lawrence,[2] nor did it benefit from the sponsorship of a prestigious university such as Columbia. It struggled alone on its unsophisticated campus in the hills of Vermont without even the support of wealthy patrons. Although its education was almost as expensive as that at the other colleges and thus it drew upon a similar pool of students, its facilities were by comparison tentative and improvised. It could not convey the impression of solidity, of soundness.

Zerby's charge that the experimental nature of the college denied it respectability might then well be tempered by such considerations as the long-term effects of Goddard's stressful financial

---

[2]The New York Times recently remarked its "bucolic campus setting," the brown austere buildings, the President's office in a converted silo (Maeroff, 1980, p. A14).

siuation. Indeed, it should be pointed out that for a time, during the sixties and early seventies, its experimental nature actually served to enlarge its student body. However, that particular student population probably helped to give Goddard the reputation it has sometimes since enjoyed--a wide-open campus full of wild-haired and off-beat students.

It should also be pointed out in this regard that certain non-Deweyan aspects of education at Goddard might more logically be assigned a degree of responsibility in creating the public image of the college--such as the lack of structure in curriculum, the emphasis upon individual freedom. However the other colleges in the sample have successfully coped with the public reaction to these elements of progressive education also in effect at their institutions. One must conclude that Goddard's problems lay, not in its Deweyan exercise of an experimental philosophy but more upon its failure, as Zerby said, to communicate its ideas successfully, upon the constraints of its chronic financial difficulties.

In summary the general conclusion was that, with the exception of Goddard, the progressive colleges were not experimental in the terms of the Model or of Deweyan philosophy. Their endeavors might more accurately be entitled "The Experiment" or perhaps even "Demonstrations of Progressive Education on the College Campus." The concern to implement faithfully and well the "new" education at the college level appeared to stifle innovation, to suppress change. They had with self-conscious self-approval relegated traditional education to more conservative institutions, but in turn their own new education became entrenched, itself resistent to change. Dewey's admonishment against a

blind attachment to a past "good" (page 79) might well have been applicable to these institutions.

Hypothesis testing. This hypothesis was earlier proposed:

> A neglected factor in the development of the selected colleges dedicated to the goals of progressive education and Deweyan philosophy has been the primacy of science and scientific method as fundamental to educational practice, a primacy Dewey consistently advocated.

In concert with the spirit of this hypothesis the Model postulated the Deweyan study of a science as the most efficient route to the acquisition of the power of reflective thinking. The Model as well, mirroring Dewey's concern that an understanding of science must form the necessary foundation for the control of science and its use for the good of society, specifies that each student undertake the study of a science for these purposes as well.

At all four colleges the hypothesis was found to be true. Science fell on the lowest rungs of any measure of esteem--enrollments, offerings, student involvement. Although science sometimes appeared as a topic for discussion in faculty meetings and in presidential reports as a matter of concern, not much attention was paid it in the early years in terms of positive action. There was little concern that a student learn its methods or understand its impact upon the society. At Sarah Lawrence there was actually a determination to avoid the rational and the precise in thought. At Bard there was clearly observed a decline in the emphasis upon scientific study in the years after the conversion from St. Stephen's. Bennington and Goddard found that students gave science a low priority both in terms of course work

and in choice of majors. In short, a non-Deweyan relegation of science to a minor role in education was observable on all four campuses. The implications of this tendency are discussed below.

Conclusions

The summary above has presented a rationale for describing the four colleges as essentially non-Deweyan in the areas tested by the Model. Their aims and goals were different, their practices sometimes similar to and sometimes different from Dewey's own methods. In light of these data, three major conclusions have been drawn.

The first conclusion.

> The expressed aims and observed practices of the progressive colleges of the sample were far removed from those implied by Deweyan philosophy. There was evident a wide chasm between progressive educational practice and Deweyan theory.

The colleges of the sample often prided themselves as interpreters of Dewey. Educators and laymen alike have frequently indiscriminately aligned them, and still do, for better or for worse, with Deweyan philosophy and with progressive education. But there have always been a few scholars who insisted that there were great differences between Dewey's philosophy and that of the Progressives in education, although common knowledge has equated these two. Scattered among those who acclaimed Dewey as the fountainhead of progressive education and others who vilified him as a source of disliked outcomes of the new education were those who perceived clear-cut discrepancies between Deweyan and progressive thought. In Dewey's defence, Berger (1959/1966) once suggested that many of those who attacked Dewey did so

without bothering to read him. He also said.

> The most common fallacy is that Dewey is the father of Progressive education and, consequently, is responsible for all that emerged from this movement. Actually, Progressive education was, in great measure, independent of Dewey's ideas. Many would be startled to know that Dewey devoted a large part of his efforts to criticizing the basic assumptions of Progressive educators. (pp. 126-127)

Dworkin called him "a reverently misinterpreted prophet rather than . . . a carefully obeyed commander" (1959/1971, p. 9). Dewey himself grew more critical of the movement as time passed and voiced his dissatisfaction in publications such as Progressive Education and Science of Education (1928/1971), his Introduction to Clapp's book (1952/1971), and Experience and Education (1938/1971).

This study reinforces the contentions of those who considered progressivism to be distinct from Deweyism. It illustrates some of the activities which drew Dewey's ire. It draws attention to points of difference between progressive education and Deweyan philosophy.

The second conclusion.

> The colleges of the sample gave to the individual an emphasis inconsistent with Deweyan philosophy. The roots of their concept of the individual were in a Romantic philosophy overlaid with a patina of psychological theory.

It is tempting to inquire how the progressive college came to equate its educational policies with those of Dewey. One might entertain the notion that the similarities which have been pointed out in the examination of teaching methods at the colleges were those that gave impetus to such an identification of progressivism with Deweyanism. It was there that was observed the greatest agreement with the Model. The use of conjoint activities such as small classes often run

as seminars, group projects in these classes, the general turning away from lecture techniques and from the use of recitations was certainly in accord with Dewey's philosophy and his practice in the Laboratory School. The emphasis upon individual activity was for Dewey the necessary starting point of inquiry. And for Dewey, too, inquiry was best accomplished in the pursuit of a problem real to the student. But Dewey justified his emphasis upon the individual through his carefully constructed theory of the role of experience. For him the end of the activity of the individual and of inquiry was not the individual but "the perfecting of knowledge," knowledge which was to be used not only for a better life for the inquirer but also for the progressive growth of society. It was clear that Dewey melded here his two goals of education, that he made each serve the other in a profitable equilibrium.

The progressives echoed many of Dewey's words and phrases: Education is life, not preparation for life; Education starts with the individual; Education must be active, not passive. All these and many others were truly "Dewey Talk." Yet residing below the plagiarized vocabulary was a conception of the individual which Dewey rejected, a view of the individual as both the starting point and the end point of education.

Herein lies a fundamental conflict in philosophy--a widely divergent view of the role of the individual in education, a view which influenced other aspects of educational practice. An examination of the roots of this progressive view of the individual might be helpful.

The roots of the progressive view of the individual. Four possible sources of this concept of the student were examined.

1. A commonly held theory is that the progressive view of the individual was an interpretation of Deweyan philosophy. As pointed out in Chapter I the public view has been that Dewey was responsible for the direction which the progressives in education traveled. However, the results of this research have established that the goals and practices at the progressive colleges were in general not those which the Deweyan College exemplified. Had the colleges of the sample held inquiry to be an essential feature of education, characteristics such as those in the College of the Model would have logically followed. This study refutes the assumption that progressivism in these colleges was an outcome of Deweyan philosophy.

There have been those (Burnett, 1979, pp. 194-195) who have suggested that perhaps what happened was that these progressives (and others) picked "willy-nilly" what they wanted from Dewey, leaving behind the rest. If true, then one must only conclude that Dewey was not the source of their philosophy, but was used as a respected tool to further their own philosophy. Clearly in no way does this make Dewey responsible for the particular brand of education developed on these campuses. If one insists upon the Deweyan influence, then the statement above must be ammended to read that the progressive view was a misinterpretation of Deweyan philosophy.

2. Progressivism in general has been proposed as the source of the educational philosophy of the progressives. Cremin suggested that progressive education arose as part of "Progressivism writ large" (1961, p. 181). Wiebe described the emergence in America of a changed concept of the child during the progressive era (Wiebe, 1967, p. 169).

This new notion of the child was integral with associated social reforms underway--compulsory education, child labor laws, health education, education of mothers in the care of the child. Yet examining the early history of the sample colleges, one finds little there sympathetic to a concept of the individual built upon the social reform ideology of the progressives. It has been demonstrated that the problems of affluence, not the deprivations of poverty, were often their areas of concern. Even the interest in the larger community, with the single exception of Goddard, was minimal. Concern with the individual was not, at these colleges whose constituency was largely the young of the wealthier segments of society, based upon social concerns. It is concluded that the concern with the individual must have had other roots.

3. Did a Romantic educational philosophy influence the progressive concept of the individual in education? It has been suggested throughout this study that elements of Rousseau's concept of the nature of the individual were detectable, in particular, the notion that the child contains within his/her own self the potential for full development. Burnett, refining a theory proposed by Brubacher (1950), suggested that there were actually two separate progressive entities in education. One was a genuine Deweyan pragmatic progressivism which only came into general public view in the 1920's and 30's. Another element which he called romantic progressivism had already become "entrenched in the hearts and minds of many elementary school people well before the turn of the century" (Burnett, p. 195). These progressives, Burnett concluded, actually had little consistent philosophy, and that

little gradually decayed into a lay romanticism wherein addicts to romanticism "seize almost any notion that can be used to exalt the natavistic, emotive character of the child's nature--and even if this requires ignoring other notions that might be systematically related to them but that seriously qualify them" (p. 196).

This study has already noted the general lack of a clearly stated philosophy in the colleges, the uncritical acceptance of progressive tenets as a basis for the educational plans. The lack of curriculum structure, the whole concept of individualized education can be seen as a conformity to the particular concept that, given freedom rather than direction, the individual will naturally flourish and bloom. At Sarah Lawrence this notion of the individual having within herself the seeds for full development, and the hesitation of faculty to direct the student for fear of interfering with this natural growth have been documented. In all the colleges, freedom from external control was a principal feature of the educational format. Although Dewey used many of the same words--such as the uselessness of external imposition, it was with a wide world of difference in meaning. For him this meant that for inquiry to be undertaken in an area outside of the experience of a child was useless. The external direction of curriculum was accepted without discussion at his Laboratory School.

There was one feature of Dewey's thought that the progressives found particularly compatible with their goals, his presentation of education as growth. Hofstadter (1963) has charged Dewey with developing and fostering the romantic concept of the child as he promulgated this definition of education, "one of the most mischievous metaphors in

the history of modern education." The word growth, he claimed, has connotations of "a natural animal process."

> Growth in the child, taken literally, goes on automatically, requiring no more than routine care and nourishment; its end is to a large degree predetermined by genetic inheritance. (Hofstadter, 1963, p. 373)

When Dewey announced that the educational process has "no end beyond itself: it is its own end" (1916/1966, pp. 50-51), Hofstadter argued, he turned the mind of educators away from the social to the personal functions of education. Hofstadter tempered his indictment by admitting that Dewey had indeed placed a strong emphasis upon the social character of education. But the damage done by Dewey's theory of growth was, he felt, that "the concept of growth became a hostage in the hands of educational thinkers who were obsessed with the child-centered school" (p. 374).

Burnett argued that examination of the chronological development of romantic progressivism would deny this formative influence to Dewey; rather the progressives later appended Dewey's thought in such chunks as bolstered their preconceived ideas. But unfortunately Dewey's consistent concern with the social aspects of education seems to have been one chunk overlooked by the progressives in their raids upon his thinking. If indeed they used Dewey's concept of growth to their own ends without reference to his social goals, it was without Dewey's approval. Dewey meant the concept of growth to be a guiding principle in education. He did not intend it to generate a revolt against all direction. Bode wrote:

> This protest against "dictation" or "regimentation," however, is not the whole story. If we make the mistake of regarding it as such, we get the curious conclusion that teachers must do no teaching at all, since all teaching is an attempt to provide "external" guidance. All we can do, then, is to take our stand with Rousseau and leave things to "nature." But, as Dewey says: "Merely to leave everything to nature was, after all, but to negate the very idea of education, it was to trust to the accidents of circumstances." (Bode, 1938, p. 76)

The data have justified the conclusion that the concept of the individual had significant rooting in the romantic philosophy of Rousseau, in the tradition of what Burnett classified as romantic progressivism. In the study of these progressive colleges of the sample, there was also seen another later influence, adding to the basis laid by Rousseau and his progressive followers. It was an overlay upon the early progressivism gleaned from the new science of psychology.

4. Cremin has suggested a psychological overtone in the progressive educational philosophy. When he turned his attention to the source of the child-centered education, Cremin distinguished not two separate entities, but one trunk with two roots. One he described as "expressionism" and illustrated with tales of Helen Marot's Normal School, Carolyn Pratt's Play School, The Lincoln School, the Walden School. In all of these the romantic concept of the child flourished; all aimed to "take the lid off youth" (Cremin, 1961, p. 207). But there was another intellectual element, he said, that helped to create the child-centered pedagogy of the Twenties. That was the influence of Freud. His emphasis upon the unconscious as the real motivating force for behavior reinforced the teacher's concern for the child as an individual and added the extra burden of protecting the child's freedom

of spirit as well as of thought (pp. 207-215).

This study lends considerable support to Cremin's hypothesis. In the sample, at each of the four colleges there appeared a consistent preoccupation with the psychological facet of education. Warren at Sarah Lawrence called education there:

> an honest endeavor to put into practice all that modern psychology can teach us about the learning process, to clear the road of obstacles and hazards, and to set the student free. (Warren, 1940, pp. 5-6)

At Bennington there was frequent repetition of a related theme--education of the whole person--in official publications, in reports and studies, in interviews generated by this writer. Faculty member Welter wrote in 1952 a critical analysis of education at Bennington.

> Education [should be] a process of discovery through which every human being should be given both the means and the impetus to continue growth, a growth defined in part by the talents and capacities and interest of that being, but in equal part by the assumptions that the mind and emotions and sensibilities should be caused to expand both in their grasp of the reality and in their estimate of the self. . . . The college student of today has been excused from the demands that a liberal education used to bring. A liberal education is dead and the self has taken its place. (Welter, 1952, p. 4) [Underlining added.]

At Bennington, he said, there has been accommodation "to modern problems by abandoning most of its values (p. 5).[3]

---

[3]However, Jones wrote, as he explained his plans for the introduction of general education at Bennington in 1945:

> "But our aim is certainly not individualism, not self expression in any romantic sense. It is rather the fullest development of individuality, of spontaneity, of the excellence of which you are capable. But it is also an education in individual responsibility through which you relate yourselves to others. It might be said that our aim is to socialize the individual. I prefer to use the word 'civilize' instead. . . .

Bard followed closely in Bennington's wake. At Goddard there was, as has been indicated from the first, a concern with the psychological. There the interest in the "whole man" has been traced to Kilpatrick and followed through the influences of Kubie, Chisholm, Rogers and Maslow. The preoccupation was with the psychological, or as Burnett commented, on the thinking of "psycho-analytic thinkers, certain cognitive psychologists, certain humanistic psychologists, and even certain existentialists" (p. 196).

Dewey dealt rather summarily with this concept of educating the whole man, an idea which he clearly saw redundant in light of his insistence that the method of inquiry facilitated common sense thinking as well as scientific judgments, no less than judgments of value. Why, he asks, should a special training differ from a general training? What was this "mysterious difference?" What was assumed?

> Where is the justification of any such assumption? Is not the whole man required in the calling of an engineer or a captain of industry? If the whole man does not at present find opportunity and outlet for himself in these callings is it not one of the main duties of the university to bring about precisely this result? The assumption that a training is good in general just in the degree in which it is good

---

> It is the business of the college to educate interest. Here I should like to distinguish the Bennington program from a view which has sometimes been thought of as characteristically 'progressive.' I mean the view that the individual student must be the one 'core' of the curriculum. The idea is that he will get a general education by pursuing all the ramifications of his own interests. . . . But if [this] denies the necessity and justification for an organized curriculum we are not [progressive]. A college cannot confine itself to passive encouragement." (Jones, 1945, pp. 8, 11-12)

Jones appears from this writing to have had a Deweyan cast to his educational philosophy.

> for nothing in particular is one for which it would be difficult to find an adequate philosophical ground. (Dewey, 1902/1969, pp. 95-96)

In summary, it is proposed that one source of progressivism in these colleges was the romantic progressivism suggested by Brubacher and Burnett. The later generation Rousseauan educators added a patina of psychological theory which reinforced the concept of the child as the core of education, as an individual who must be freed to develop the innate potential with which he or she was born. Although this conviction resulted in widespread deviation from the Model in the areas of curriculum requirement and other traditional structures, it produced some coincidental conformity to the Model in the matter of teaching methods. However, the similarity was in reality based upon a philosophical concept of the individual with decided non-Deweyan characteristics.

The third conclusion.

> The colleges of the sample largely neglected science whereas the Model specified the study of science as consistent with a Deweyan education. This neglect was in effect an anti-intellectual practice.

Throughout the chapters above it has been demonstrated that Dewey assigned science a major role in education. Mastery of its methods was the focus of one of his major goals for education. Knowledge of the results of its inquiries throughout the years was central to the realization of the social goals for education, since many of society's dilemmas arose from the changes brought by the application of science. His concern was then two-fold; education should teach how scientists think; it should acquaint the young scholars with what effects science

has had upon the society. When faced with the question of how to accomplish these two goals in practice, the educator seems to have at least two options. Dewey selected an obvious solution in his Laboratory School: define a curriculum structure which insures that each student receive training in both process and product. A second option will be discussed later. However, the colleges of the sample were not free to avail themselves of this direct solution. Their concept of the individual prohibited them from imposing upon her/him structure such as a requirement that one or two years of science be taken. As a consequence a significant number of the graduates of these schools took no science; another large group was minimally involved. In addition it has been established that at all but Goddard, scores on comparative tests showed graduates to be below average in the area of science and in critical thinking. When science was not required, the free choice of students was in general to avoid this area of knowledge.

The implications of this neglect of science are numerous. It disrupts completely the basic premise of the Deweyan education. Without skill in inquiry, the use of scientific thinking, without a knowledge of the power of science, the graduates of these progressive colleges are less well equipped to make reasonable judgments. S/he is subject then to the restrictions imposed by ignorance, prejudice and an emotional bias in decision making. As such these graduates are poorly prepared in this area to serve the progressive democracy. Dewey would say that education without science would not confer the freedom which he saw as the desired result of a Deweyan education--the power to control one's life effectively.

There are other broader effects. It is proposed that the bias of these colleges was in essence anti-scientific and as such anti-intellectual. It has been documented that Sarah Lawrence declared that the methods of science would be avoided. The other colleges made no such prejudiced statements but nevertheless gave science an extremely minor role. The actual teaching of science was at Sarah Lawrence and the other colleges directed towards the practical. The academic substance of scientific material was deliberately subjugated to its application to the interests of the students. At Sarah Lawrence biology was focused around marriage-and-child concerns. Chemistry at Goddard was taught as it related to personal concerns. The unspoken theme was that only if science interested the student was its study justified. Its claim to a significant content, valuable in itself and as a basis for techniques of inquiry, was denied. "Teach the child, not the subject" was considered the ruling precept.

Hofstadter (1963) has recorded the decline in the teaching of science at lower levels, a consequence, he believed, of the anti-intellectual influence of educational leaders, particularly those involved in Life Adjustment Education (p. 341). He has pointed to the continuing debate between the intellectualists who held to the ideal of mastery of subject matter and their contemporaries who placed the needs of the child in the center of education (pp. 323-359). The neglect of science at the progressive colleges would have been in Hofstadter's view another example of anti-intellectual bias. Jencks and Riesman characterized the Sarah Lawrences and Goddards as "offbeat" colleges that have "deemphasized academic competence in favor of other

virtues" (1968, p. 144). This writer proposes that the data of this study, indicating not only the low profile taken by science but also the general abandonment of coverage of subject matter in favor of content tailored to the interests of students, reveals an anti-intellectual tendency. Dewey in a criticism of the progressive school himself deplored such a treatment of science or any subject.

> Ultimately it is the absence of intellectual control through a significant subject matter which stimulates the deplorable egotism, cockiness, impertinence and disregard for the rights of others apparently considered by some persons to be the inevitable accompaniment, if not the essence of freedom. (Dewey, 1930, p. 205)

He continued, suggesting that the progressives who had indeed accomplished much in terms of fostering mental independence in the student could have obtained even better results if "emphasis were put on the rational freedom which is the fruit of objective knowledge and understanding."

It must, however, be considered that other options for a Deweyan inclusion of science in education are possible. One scheme can be envisioned closely related to the techniques of the progressive colleges. Suppose one accepts the premise that a structured curriculum indeed violated the basic philosophy of the college. With that as a given, how might the teaching of science have been accomplished in accord with a Deweyan philosophy?

It seems to be logical that in place of a curriculum dedicated to Deweyan goals there must be available a faculty so dedicated. In order for the desired outcome to evolve, all faculty must have full knowledge that one function of education was the integration of inquiry

and scientific knowledge into the academic program. The conscious effort would have to be made to coordinate faculty efforts so that at every turn the student is challenged to inquire, to seek out the scientific knowledge of the culture in his pursuit of his interests. Science when it was directly taught would also be infiltrated with related aspects of other fields. With the assistance, then, of advisors who too were cognizant of the clearly defined philosophy of the college, a student then should depart from the campus secure in the knowledge that the college that graduated him/her had judged him/her adequately versed in both scientific knowledge and in inquiry, as well as in other attributes held important at the college.

Tantalizing glimpses of just such an education are caught as one reads what has been written about Bennington or listens to Dr. Woodworth talk about student-choreographed dances inspired by his time-lapse films of a flower blooming. Reports like Goddard's study of the river flowing through the campus, or of the food supply of deer in a nearby park--all these bring a sense of exuberance to the study of science often absent in its traditional presentation. Certainly even conventional science might well remove some of its academic content to make room for at least a modicum of the progressive style of science teaching. When C.P. Snow wrote The Two Cultures (1959/1961), he was expressing just such a sentiment: general education needs science, but science needs as well some infusion of artistry. At these colleges they gave excellent support for one aspect of experience, but failed to balance the total educational program with the scientific. However, it must be admitted that the traditional education of scientists also

fails in this regard. In its zest for subject matter, for scientific excellence, it has as well neglected the world of art and culture. If one examines the backgrounds of the most accomplished scientists of world history one finds most usually a broad educational experience, not a pure concentration in a single field. Perhaps undergraduate and graduate education in the sciences needs some modification in the direction taken by the progressives.

At any rate, one must conclude that of all the students of the colleges, science majors, except at Sarah Lawrence, had the best opportunity to receive a Deweyan education. Conversely, the education of non-science students at a progressive college most likely was less Deweyan than at the usual traditional college where at least some expsoure to science was the norm.

In summary, the Deweyan concern with science as a significant tool for the improvement of society with the incorporation of science's methods into the process of inquiry, with the familiarization of the individual with the power of science for good and evil, was not shared by the progressive educators of the sample colleges. A general neglect of science was coexistent with a disregard for training in reflective thinking. The failure to devise a mechanism for education in either science or inquiry stemmed, it is proposed, from the individual-centered philosophy of the colleges, a focus decried by Dewey throughout the years. The effect of a related tendency to subjugate subject matter content in science (and in other fields) to the interests of the individual led to a deemphasis upon academic excellence and had, it is suggested, an anti-intellectual influence upon students on these

progressive campuses, an aspect also criticized by Dewey.

Speculations

After all is said and done, after the conclusions have been drawn and the broad and subtle differences between the sample colleges and the College of the Model delineated, one ponders the question of the impact of these four colleges that struggled mightily against financial stress and external invective to pursue their particular goals. What have they accomplished in the educational world? Are they an important aspect of American educational history or are they just four little colleges with a novel idea for the education of the wealthy young? Does it matter that they were not as Deweyan as they and countless others thought them to be?

Several sources have commented upon their long-range influence. Boroff wrote:

> Progressivism has been seeping upward to its sources in the intellectual highlands. . . . Many colleges now have departments of personnel services. . . . What college does not talk of meeting the individual needs of the student? . . . . Colleges then have been catching up to Sarah Lawrence but the latter--along with Antioch, Bennington, Reed, and a few others--is still way ahead of the academic procession. (Boroff, 1961, p. 161)

Woodworth (Note 3) and Brockway (Note 4) both agreed that Bennington's (and the progressive colleges' in general) greatest contribution was the inclusion of the arts in the curriculum. At Bennington the introduction of Dance Education was particularly unique. One faculty member at Bennington believed that "a lot of places have taken their cues from places like Bennington" (Frankenthaler, 1972).

But Pitkin (Note 5) considered that Goddard had little impact on the shape of higher education. Hyatt in his analysis of Bennington called it "an isolated experiment in higher education" (Note 6, p. 55).

It is probably safe to surmise that their example did serve to moderate the traditional approach of higher education in such directions as an increased respect for the arts, greater attention to interdisciplinary studies, improved personnel and guidance services, and less regimentation of instruction. However, as was pointed out in the early pages of the chapter on Bennington College, such practices were not original with these four colleges. Each of the innovations of these institutions was already in effect at some college in the country. By the time that Goddard was founded (1938) there was, as Newsweek pointed out, really nothing strikingly new in its program ("Goddard at 25," 1963, p. 29). When one recalls that the plans upon which Sarah Lawrence, Bennington and Bard were established were in essence designed to implement the already existing progressive ideas being worked out at lower levels and to provide the graduates of secondary schools easier access to higher education, one must credit these institutions with little creative activity influencing subsequent college education. Rather one sees them as promoting through the more respected medium of higher education the ideas of earlier educators. Therefore, their role was more that of co-workers in the progressive field, applying progressivism at the college level than that of pioneers in education.

What about the findings of this study that these colleges were non-Deweyan, or even in some ways, anti-Deweyan? How does one explain

this paradox or understand how it came to be?

This study points to an unlikely but unavoidable conclusion. It has documented the very strong influence of Dr. Kilpatrick upon three of the colleges. Bennington was directed by him from its early stages of planning; he wrote its first aims (see Appendix A2); one of his former students was chosen by him to be its first president. Kilpatrick served as Chairman of the Board at Bennington from 1931-1938.

His role in the founding of Goddard has also been detailed. Tim considered Kilpatrick to be the strongest philosophical influence at the college--he interpreted, Tim said, Dewey's ideas on education to Goddard's faculty and administration as he chaired conferences evaluating their programs in his position as Trustee. It has been reported that Kilpatrick himself found Goddard a "thoroughgoing progressive college, exemplifying some of the soundest concepts of good education" (Tennenbaum, 1951, p. 215). Kilpatrick perceived himself to be the author of Goddard's strong social goals.

> He urged that Goddard break down the barriers between college and community and that students learn to live good lives while working in this merged community. He urged that the college should aim to prepare students to live and to work in Vermont towns and villages; that Goddard should seek to make Vermont a better place in which to live for everybody--children, students, farmers, factory workers, professional workers. (p. 214)

Bard of course was structured almost in toto upon the Bennington Plan so that it too bore the impress of Kilpatrick's philosophy. And in a footnote (p. 214) Tennenbaum added this sole reference to Sarah Lawrence:

> Kilpatrick believes that Sarah Lawrence College in certain respects has done a better job of translating theory into practice than even Bennington College. It appears that Marion Edward Coates, the first president of Sarah Lawrence, heard his Colony Club address, and was much impressed by it; she tried to adapt her practices accordingly. Students at Sarah Lawrence College participate in community and social services, and, says Kilpatrick, "when you get anybody to work at something he can do, that's a way of ameliorating personality problems." It is a source of great satisfaction to Kilpatrick to know that he has had a hand in the creation of Bennington and, though to a much smaller degree, Sarah Lawrence College, two outstandingly progressive educational institutions.

It is indeed curious that Kilpatrick was so involved in the four colleges. The extent of his influence was so great that one might well call this group "The Kilpatrician Colleges." But what makes it especially intriguing is that Kilpatrick is generally considered to be a true spokesman for Dewey. For example, Burnett has written:

> The pragmatic and <u>genuine</u> followers of Dewey's thought are capable of explanation only on an individual basis. There is not one bit of doubt (in my mind, at least) that William Heard Kilpatrick, John L. Childs, R. Bruce Raup, George S. Counts, Harold Rugg, Theodore Brameld, Kenneth Benne, B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and Ernest Bayles (to mention widely read followers) all laid down or presupposed the pragmatic criterion as basic to their philosophizing. Each did it in an original way, and some of them perhaps did distort it on occasion--but not fully in the direction of romanticism. (1979, p. 195)

He then continued in a footnote:

> Of the people mentioned, Kilpatrick is the one that I have most often heard depicted as being fundamentally romantic rather than pragmatic, and responsible for thus distorting Dewey's teaching to thousands of students and readers. I do not find this depiction of Kilpatrick very surprising when considering some of his discussions of "the whole child," "child centeredness," and the "project method." However, Dewey was to remark (perhaps because he had heard such characterizations) that Kilpatrick had "never fallen

> victim to the one-sidedness of identifying progressive education with child-centered education" (John Dewey, "Introduction," in Samuel Tenenbaum, William H. Kilpatrick: Trail Blazer in Education (New York: Harper, 1954), p. viii. (p. 198)

Burnett did not further support his assessment of Kilpatrick as non-romantic, nor further comment upon Dewey's rather surprising remark. But certainly this study presents empirical evidence linking Kilpatrick with the romantic progressives by way of his ties to these colleges. If he was in fact a strong influence in their developing philosophy, which seems indisputable; if he did indeed support the individual-centered education that each practiced, which also seems undeniable in light of all the data; if he did approve as he has said of the form the colleges took, then one must conclude that his philosophy was more romantic progressivism than Deweyanism.

Thus there can be attributed to Kilpatrick some of the confusion of Deweyanism with progressivism that has been discussed above. If Kilpatrick, who worked and studied with Dewey, could consider the educational practices of the colleges Deweyan (by inference since they reflected his own philosophy), one can hardly fault the layman for the same misapprehension. If Kilpatrick, the Million-Dollar Professor, calls Sarah Lawrence--the anti-Deweyan college of the sample--a living example of his own theories in action, then why shouldn't Merry in Maine (see Chapter I) confound Dewey and "namby-pamby" schools?

Does it matter that Kilpatrick and these colleges considered themselves Deweyan? Yes, it matters greatly. Unless educators understand the distinction between Deweyan and romantic progressive thought, as long as these two are confused, there can be little forward movement

in the direction of a modern Deweyan education and away from the "vulgarizations" of his ideas promulgated by some progressives. A clearer understanding of Deweyan philosophy by the public, by parents and students, might create an atmosphere more receptive to his major goals of education and his particular means to his ends. A general appreciation of the pervasive role of science in his educational philosophy might lead to a wider acceptance of science as a tool for good. Science still continues to exert its two-faced influence; man must still face the necessity of judging what he wants to do with it.

If all the "ifs" could be realized, one might then in time anticipate yet another step beyond the College of the Model--toward what Dewey called "The Schools of Utopia."

> The most Utopian thing in Utopia is that there are no schools at all. Education is carried on without anything of the nature of schools, or, if this is so extreme that we cannot conceive of it as educational at all, then we may say nothing of the sort at present we know as schools. Children, however, are gathered together in association with older and more mature people who direct their activity.
>
> The assembly places all have large grounds, gardens, orchards, greenhouses, and none of the buildings in which the children and the older people gather will hold much more than 200 people. . . .
>
> And inside these buildings, which are all of them of the nature of our present open-air schools in their physical structure, there are none of the things we usually associate with our present schools. Of course, there are no mechanical rows of screwed down desks. . . . Then there are the workshops, with their apparatus for carrying on activities with all kinds of material--wood, iron, textiles. There are historic museums and scientific laboratories and books everywhere . . . (1933, p. 7)

Reference Notes

1. Zerby, C. Personal interview. October, 1980.

2. Rauschenbush, E. Address, Bard Symposium, February 19, 1952.

3. Woodworth, R. Personal interview. June 15, 1980.

4. Brockway, T. Personal interview. June 15, 1980.

5. Pitkin, T. Personal interview. August, 1979.

6. Hyatt, D. Towards an ideal liberal arts college. Apparently a paper done for a course (Ed. 326 May 14, 1958.) It includes personal interviews with former presidents Burkhardt and Leigh. Typewritten. (Bennington archives)

Reference List

Berger, M.I. "John Dewey and progressive education today." In Brickman, W., & Lehrer, S. (Eds.) John Dewey: Master Educator. New York: Random House, 1966. (Originally published, 1959).

Bode, B.H. Progressive education at the crossroads. New York: Newson & Co., 1938.

Boroff, D. Campus, U.S.A. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.

Brubacher, J. Modern philosophies of education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Burnett, J. Whatever happened to John Dewey? Teachers College Record, Winter, 1979, pp. 192-210.

Cremin, L. The transformation of the school. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1961.

Dewey, J. The educational situation. New York: Arno Press, 1969. (Originally published, 1902.)

Dewey, J. Democracy and Education. New York: Free Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1916.)

Dewey, J. Progressive education and the science of education. Reprinted in M. Dworkin (Ed.) Dewey on education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959/1971. (Originally published, 1928.)

Dewey, J. How much freedom in new schools? New Republic, July 9, 1930, pp. 204-206.

Dewey, J. Dewey outlines utopian schools. New York Times, April 23, 1933, p. 7.

Dewey, J. Experience and education. New York: Macmillan, 1971. (Originally published, 1938.)

Dewey, J. Introduction to Clapp, E.R. The use of resources in education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. Reprinted in Dworkin, M. (Ed.). Dewey on education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971. (Originally published, 1959.)

Dworkin, M. (Ed.). Dewey on education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971. (Originally published, 1959.)

Frankenthaler, H. Sometimes all the magic ends converge. Bennington College Quadrille, Fall, 1972, pp. 37-40.

Goddard at 25. Newsweek, April 8, 1963, pp. 88-89.

Hofstadter, R. Anti-intellectualism in American life. New York: Random House, 1963.

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. The academic revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.

Jones, L. Comments on general education. Speech at the College Community Meeting, August 26, 1945. In Bennington College Bulletin, September, 1945, pp. 5-17.

Maeroff, G. Innovative college fights for survival. The New York Times, November 14, 1980, p. A14.

Snow, C. Two cultures: And the scientific revolution. New York: Cambridge Press, 1961. (Originally published, 1959.)

Tennenbaum, S. William Heard Kilpatrick: Trail blazer in education. New York: Harper, 1951.

Warren, C. New design for women's education. New York: Frederick Stokes, 1940.

Welter, R. On liberal education. Bennington College Quadrille. Spring, 1974, pp. 3-6.

Wiebe, R. The search for order. New York: Hill & Wang, 1967.

APPENDIX A

A1 Endorsement for a College in Old Bennington after First Meeting

Reprinted in McCullough, E. Recollections. Bennington College Bulletin, June, 1957, p. 70.

Bennington, Vermont
September 6, 1923

We, the undersigned, heartily endorse Dr. Ravi-Booth's project for the establishment in Old Bennington of an institution of learning for women, including vocational courses.

We therefore pledge ourselves to endorse the movement to establish in Old Bennington a college for women.

There is no more desirable site in all New England for such an educational foundation. The beauty of nature, the quality of the air and water, the historic background, the conveniences of a progressive town of ten thousand people a mile away, with its fine churches, hospital, doctors, and stores; and the ease with which it can be reached from New York, Boston, and Montreal as well as from all the cities and towns lying between these centers of population, make of Old Bennington the ideal location for a great educational institution.

Elizabeth H.S. Eddy
Hope H. Colgate
Mary R. Sanford
Susan Colgate Cleveland
Margaret C. Dennis
Florence S. Johnson
Katherine E. Hubbell
Frances Coleman Holden
Fanny Abbott Meagher
Fannie Seymour Patterson
Helen Parmelee Shoemaker
Mab Norton Barber
Katharine Bingham Hall

A2 Plan for Bennington College Developed by Dr. Ravi-Booth and Dr. Kilpatrick

1. A college for girls, of first rank, non-vocational.

2. A curriculum based on the best available thought, an attempt to do for the college what Lincoln School is attempting in elementary and secondary education.

3. Such administrative control as to insure that in the remote future the best thought of that day, not the dead hand of tradition shall rule.

A3 Old Bennington Plan outlined by Prof. Kilpatrick

Handwritten copy found in the Bennington archives. Undated.

I. Two goal posts in education

1865: Colleges for women in all respects like those for men

1898: Study of Education itself

Present position

1. We have established the original thesis as to capacity of women

2. We now have available a mass of detailed information: methods of attack; means for measuring

II. Planks on which plan is to rest

A. Cultural--first and foremost
Does not refer to subject matter. Refers to effect on student: frees her from prejudice. Refines and broadens her interests

B. Honest and stubborn effort to use as little as possible of mere tradition.

C. Leave future control of institution to the best thought of the future.

D. College entrance: Free secondary education from its bondage to college; free candidate from mis-spent time; . . . better selection of college students; drop most specified subjects; intelligence tests used; chief requisite is fair opportunity + ability.

E. Administration: not by units, points, or courses. An extension of the honor system. Greater intensity--3 years of 42 weeks each. Careful study of individuals to determine what courses should be . . . (undecipherable) what the content of the courses should be. . . . Education is life, not for life.

F. Selection of administrative machinery

1. Choose body of trustees committed to the policy

2. Next President: -----

3. Man trained in research to report to faculty.
   Head personnel work.

4. Alliance with departments of education.

   Systems of 8 graduate fellowships conducted by the college. Holders to be picked from graduate students in education in the best departments in leading colleges.

A4 Educators' Conference; North Bennington
August, 1924

The group of men and women invited to discuss the proposal that a new college be established at Bennington agree upon the following suggestions:

(1) That it be for women only.

(2) That there is need for such a new college, first, because existing colleges for women are overcrowded; and, second, because a new institution will be freer to bring educational practice into line with more recent progress in educational theory.

(3) That this college should be the equal of the best colleges for women as regards its standards for entrance and graduation.

(4) The college should appeal exclusively to no particular type but should expect to draw students from all sections and all economic groups; seeking especially such students as expect to live simply and work seriously.

(5) That the college should not commit itself to the traditional subjects for entrance preparation, nor to the written subject examination as the principle means of testing fitness for entrance; but should avail itself of the newer methods of testing ability and promise; and that the college should admit the girl of exceptional ability even though that ability is not manifested along all the usually demanded lines.

(6) While the actual curriculum should be determined only as the result of prolonged and careful study by those who will be placed in educational charge, yet it seems to us desirable that it be based closely upon life and the enrichment of life; and that fields of human interest be the units for curriculum construction rather than limited portions of subject matter. That the curriculum shall not only present information concerning fields of endeavor open to women, but shall also offer courses that give the fundamental preparation on which more technical and direct training could be based.

(7) That specific provision be made for personality study, with the objects first, of helping the college to select its students; second, of helping each girl to direct her college work, to choose her vocation, and, in general, to realize her fullest potentialities in living.

(8) That every step in the founding of the college be taken in the light of the best available educational thought and experience; and that specific measures be adopted at the founding to keep the college continuously abreast of the best educational thought of the time.

A5 List of Participants and Their Affiliations
Proceedings: Bennington College Conference;
Bennington, Vt., June 20-21, 1930

Typewritten. Bennington archives.

Wilford Aiken, Director, John Burroughs School, St. Louis, Mo.

Willard W. Beatty, Supt., Bronxville Public Schools, Bronxville, N.Y.

Ralph Boothby, Headmaster, Metairie Park Country Day School, New Orleans, La.

John Clark, Principal, Lincoln High School, New York City

Dr. M.C. Del Manzo, Provost, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Frederic H. Kent, 458 West 116th Street, New York City

Mrs. Frederic H. Kent, 458 West 116th Street, New York City

Helen Lynd, Member of the Faculty, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y.

Robert S. Lynd, Executive Secretary, Social Science Research Council, New York City

Hall Park McCullough, Esq., North Bennington, Vermont

Mrs. H.P. McCullough, North Bennington, Vermont

Mrs. Clarence M. Woolley, Greenwich, Conn.

Robert D. Leigh, President, Bennington College

Mrs. Robert D. Leigh, Bennington, Vermont

Fred O. Newman, Assistant to President, Bennington College

Dr. Fred A. Moss, Center for Psychological Service, Washington, D.C.

Helen Parkhurst, Principal, The Dalton Schools, Inc., New York City

Mary E. Pierce, Director, The Park School, Cleveland, Ohio

E.M. Sipple, Director, The Park School, Baltimore, Md.

Eugene Randolph Smith, Headmaster, The Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Mrs. Eugene Randolph Smith, Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Herbert Smith, Principal, The Fieldston School, Fieldston, N.Y.

Perry Dunlap Smith, Headmaster, North Shore Country Day School, Winnetka, Illinois

Morton D. Snyder, Headmaster, Rye Country Day School, Rye, N.Y.

Katharine Taylor, Director, The Shady Hill School, Cambridge, Mass.

Carleton Washburne, Supt., Winnetka Public Schools, Winnetka, Ill.

Dr. Eleanor Rowland Wembridge, Referee, The Court of Domestic Relations, Cleveland, Ohio

Edward Yeomans, Principal, The Ojai Valley School, Ojai, California

Dr. John J. Coss, Columbia University, New York City

Mrs. George S. Franklin, New York City

Mrs. Arthur J. Holden, Old Bennington, Vt.

Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

A6 Essential Features of the Bennington Program

Leigh, R.D. The educational plan for Bennington College. Revised edition. New York: Bennington College, 1931.

1. Selective Plan of Admission on the basis of quality of the candidate's entire school record and personal history, with no required examinations or certificates in a specified list of school subjects (pp. 6-7).

2. Tuition to Cover Full Cost of Instruction with generous scholarships for those who need and deserve them (p. 8).

3. Selective Regional and Special Scholarships awarded on a four year basis to prospective students of unusual promise (pp. 8-9).

4. Individually Arranged Work for the First Two Years taking full account of previous school courses and of differences in personal development and interest, instead of general requirements or free election of courses (pp. 9-10).

5. Two Year Sequence of Introductory Courses designed to show the significant content and the particular method in each major field (pp. 9-10)

6. Recognition of the Fine Arts as one of the four major fields in the college curriculum (pp. 9-10).

7. Preparation During First Two Years for Informal, Individual Methods of the latter years by membership in a trial major conference group (p. 10).

8. Tool Courses, such as mathematics and foreign languages, prescribed only for those who look forward to major work requiring their use; not for all (p. 10).

9. Advancement from Junior Division (first two years) to Senior Division (last two years) only be demonstration of distinct ability and interest in one of the major fields; no advancement to Senior Division or award of degree by mere accumulation of grades or by passing a specified number of courses (pp. 10-11).

10. Work of Last Two Years for All in a Chosen Major Field similar in aim and method to honors type of work now open to selected students in several existing colleges (pp. 11-12).

11. Major Work for Students Not Limited to Departmental Specialization but planned for varying vocational, pre-vocational, or avocational life interests (pp. 11-12).

12. Opportunity to Follow Side Interests as they develop, through individual work rather than by attending courses, thus aiming at self-dependence (p. 12).

13. A Long Winter Recess giving both students and faculty opportunity for travel, field work, and educational advantages of metropolitan life (p. 12).

14. Provision for Non-Resident Work in University and Other Centers during last year or two whenever facilities for advanced work are more favorable than at Bennington (pp. 12-13).

15. Community Support of "Student Activities" which have intellectual, artistic, or recreational value and limitation of campus orgnizations to such activities (pp. 13-14).

16. Small, Self-Governing House Groups for All, serving as centers of social life and informal faculty-student contacts (pp. 13-14).

17. Continuous Utilization of All Knowledge of Student Personnel for more accurate, thorough diagnosis of the real needs of the modern girls in home, school, college, and occupation (p. 14).

18. Faculty Chosen Primarily for Teaching Ability; adjustable and ample faculty salaries, with policy of careful selection and reappointment of faculty, President, and Trustees, to avoid "dead wood" and to maintain flexibility (pp. 14-16).

A7 Aims for Bennington College.

Bennington College. Bennington College Bulletin, 1932-33, p. 4.

Aims

The underlying ideas determining the choice and survival of the specific teaching devices and activities of the new College may be summarized as follows:

(1) that education is a process continuing through life and persists most effectively throughout the important years of adulthood when one has acquired the habit of educating oneself;

(2) that a principal aim of the College should be to accustom its students to the habit of engaging voluntarily in learning rather than of submitting involuntarily at certain periods to formal instruction;

(3) that such educational self-dependence can be developed most effectively if the student works at tasks which having meaning, significance, or interest to her;

(4) that continuing education, self-initiated, is likely to take place most surely where the student has attained expertness, or a sense of mastery in some few fields of enduring interest or use, rather than acquired smatterings in a great many fields;

(5) that external disciplines such as compulsory class attendance, competitive and publicly-awarded grades and prizes, periodic written examination on formalized blocks of knowledge, and numerical accumulation of credits to earn degrees interfere seriously with real incentives and internal disciplines related to the student's own developing purposes and interests;

(6) that direct experiences--planning, organizing, manipulating, constructing, and investigating--in cooperation with book learning and the acquisition of knowledge are valuable means for developing permanent interests pursued without the necessity of external compulsion;

(7) that tools of learning, such as statistics, and the use of English, to have meaning as well as to be most economically mastered, should as far as possible be connected immediately or in the process of learning with the ends or uses for which they are instruments rather than acquired wholesale as separate disciplines related but vaguely to a possible distant use;

(8) that there is a wide variation between persons and in the same person at different times as to the subjects or problems which, having meaning, will consequently engage the person in active learning which leads to understanding; that, therefore, programs of college work should at all points allow for individual variation;

(9) that intellectual development cannot and should not be isolated from the development of the whole personality and that as far as possible the general college arrangements, especially individual guidance, should give proper weight to physical, emotional, moral, and aesthetic as well as to intellectual factors in personal growth;

(10) that the College, jointly with other educational agencies, should accept responsibility for cultivating in its students by all available means attitudes of social responsibility, social participation and cooperation rather than aloofness; that it should promote a sympathetic but objective and realistic understanding of the world of our own days as well as a sense of perspective derived from understanding of the past; an attitude of suspended judgment towards the strange and the new, and tolerance towards persons and customs alien to the student's own experience.

APPENDIX B

B1 BARD COLLEGE

To the Trustees of Bard College:

You are hereby given confidential notice of the following matters:

1. That the stated meeting of the Trustees, called to be held on February 7, 1939, and adjourned for lack of a quorum to March 8, 1939, and further adjourned for lack of a quorum to March 21, 1939, was held, a quorum being present, and was further adjourned to reconvene on Monday, March 27, 1939, at 4 P.M. in Room 311 (the room above the Trustees' Room), Columbia University, New York City.

2. That a report of the Special Reorganization Committee was submitted to said meeting on March 21, 1939, recommending to the Board of Trustees adoption of appropriate resolutions suspending the operation of Bard College on June 30, 1939.

3. That resolutions in accordance with said recommendation were duly adopted, the final vote being 5 votes for said resolutions, 1 vote against, and 4 Trustees not voting.

4. That thereupon it was unanimously voted that the adoption of said resolutions be reconsidered in view of the small number of Trustees who voted upon so important a matter, and of the fact that but 10 of the 21 Trustees of Bard College were in attendance.

5. That the urgency of a decision with respect to the future of Bard College, the consequences of such decision, and the responsibilities of each Trustee in the premises are such that it is of the highest importance that the adjourned meeting on March 27, 1939 be fully attended.

By Order of the Board of Trustees.

Oliver B. James,
Secretary

B2 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES:
February 1944, Faculty

1. The basic principle of the present Bard College educational program is that each student's curriculum shall be built up individually with attention to the student's interests and abilities. This principle shall be retained in the program for the future.

2. The aim of education for each student is a twofold aim: the development of a special interest in one field of study, often with a definite vocational or professional objective in mind, and the broadening of the student's understanding of the civilization in which we live.

3. For the development of the special interest we shall coninue our present trial major and major system, with the tutorial-adviser relationship as prominent as before and with further development of the control by divisional faculties. The emphasis on the major interest shall come first in the student's college program.

4. For the broadening of the student's understanding, we shall put more responsibility upon the teachers of the major subject to stimulate curiosity into other fields and to awaken the student's mind to the relations between his own field and others. We shall all plan courses in the various divisions for non-major students, which will be directly concerned with assisting the advisers in this work of general education. We may consider the appointment of a permanent faculty group to plan this part of our program. The chief principle to be adopted, however, is the close connection between the major field and the general education program, and the chief danger is the separation of the two.

5. We shall construct new curricula in broad areas of study, and guiding programs for various types of students. These are not to be set up in place of individual curricula, but will be expected to assist in the working out of the individual plans.

B3 STATEMENT OF AIMS FOR THE COLLEGE: Faculty, 1951.

The Bard College student:

1. should develop a genuine interest in things intellectual and artistic sufficient to motivate continuing self-education in several diverse fields;

2. should make a substantial start in formulating his ethical standards, as well as intellectual or artistic standards in his field of concentration, and should have some understanding of the crucial role of standards in intellectual and artistic work and of his urgent and continuing need to develop and re-examine his own standards; should value and respect his standards and measure himself and his work against them, and should act in accordance with these standards;

3. should show ability, in more than one field, to attack an intellectual or artistic problem, translate it into workable terms, organize his procedures, locate and use relevant materials, synthesize his findings, and produce a creditable result;

4. should, whatever his major, be able to read English accurately and intelligently, and to write it intelligently and clearly; and in addition, be able to understand and use such special media of expression (e.g., foreign languages, mathematics, tools and materials of the arts) as are required in the fields of his interests;

5. should master the materials, techniques and methods necessary for beginning to do independent work and to make independent judgements in his field of concentration; should develop the knowledge and confidence necessary to this mastery and have a reasonable understanding of the extent of his field, its history, its relations to other fields and its place in the culture; and should have some grasp of one or more other fields;

6. should have some grasp of the history of mankind and of the broad lines of intellectual and artistic development and achievement. (Bard College Bulletin, 1967-68, p. 9.)

APPENDIX C

C1 Principles Underlying the Philosophy of Goddard College, as Elucidated by Dr. Kilpatrick at the Conference in 1938.

The most fundamental fact of life is change. Educational prescriptions are good only for a specific person at a specific time and place. Education, like society, must be constantly remodeled; and while we may look to the past to see where we came from, we can find in it no arrows showing us where we are going.

We learn only what we inwardly accept. Much teaching is helping an individual become ready to receive learning; and until such readiness exists, all the drilling and driving a teacher can do will produce no learning.

Education is a moral concern, in which intellect is understood as a function of a whole person, behaving--increasingly, the more he becomes educated--with an awareness of and responsibility for the social and personal consequences of his behavior.

C2 The Aims of Goddard College, published in the last catalog of Goddard Seminary and Junior College, 1938.

"The education of young men and women of junior college age for real living through the actual facing of real life problems as an essential part of their educational program.

"The adoption of the idea that education is a process of securing a better understanding and an enriching of life rather than the teaching of subject matter in prescribed courses.

"The study of vocation as a part of living rather than as something distinct and an end in itself.

"The integration of the life of the college with the life of the community, and the consequent breaking down of the barriers that separate the school from real life.

"The use of the community as a laboratory in which students may see life as a whole rather than as a collection of unrelated parts.

"The participation of students in the formation of policies, in the management of the college, and in the performance of work essential to its maintenance and operation, and the inclusion of such work in the educational program.

"The development of a religious attitude that is free from sectarianism. Religion is here conceived in a broad sense as a way of unifying personality by getting a unified grasp on life's problems. Any activity which is pursued on behalf of an ideal end of universal worth is religious.

"The provision of educational opportunities for adults."

APPENDIX D

THE FINANCIAL HISTORY OF BARD

A review of the financial history of Bard College supports the suggestion that fiscal concerns shaped educational policy[1] and illustrates, in extreme form, a general characteristic of the sample colleges--the chronic financial stress they all experienced.

St. Stephen's Seminary. The Seminary was incorporated on March 20, 1860 (Hapson, 1910, p. 15). It was authorized to "establish, conduct and maintain a seminary of learning in Red Hook, Dutchess County, to be a training college for the education and Christian training of young men who desire to enter the sacred ministry in the Protestant Episcopal Church." Later, these privileges were extended to students not dedicated to the ministry. This act of incorporation was the fruition of the efforts of John Bard, a "country squire of wide interests and deep religiosity" ("History of the College," 1951, p. 9); a man from a distinguished family long part of mid-Hudson Valley life.

Dr. John Bard, his great-grandfather, and Samuel Bard, his grandfather, were well-known physicians. Dr. John Bard was for years a close personal friend of Benjamin Franklin. Dr. Samuel Bard, it is reported, was George Washington's physician and an "early luminary" of

---

[1]Note, however, that in a 1963 self-evaluation, the College stated, "It has been a guiding principle of the College that financial considerations should not dictate or unduly influence its academic policy" (Kline, Note 1, p. 4).

King's College (later Columbia College) (p. 9). William Bard, the younger John's father, was, it is claimed, one of the founders of the life insurance industry in America.

It was the younger John Bard who, with the assistance of powerful friends and relatives, founded St. Stephen's Seminary, later known as Bard College.

St. Stephen's survived the Civil War years, although it understandably remained small. In 1863, Reverend Robert Brinckerhoff Fairbairn became Warden and "ruled the College with a firm hand for thirty-five years" ("History, 1955-56, p. 86). St. Stephen's became known for its excellence as a pre-theological school "dominated by a spirit of the classics." When the Warden retired at the age of eighty, a succession of clergymen and educators was seen at the Seminary. In 1919 Reverend Bernard Iddings Bell became its chief administrator.

As time passed the need for adaptation by the College became evident. The beginning of severe financial problems came, according to Magee, as an aftermath of a student strike, a serious disturbance at the College related to the exercise of disciplinary authority. The wide-spread publicity was harmful, Magee stated, to "the morale, enrollment and financial support of the college" (Magee, Note 2, p. 110). Prior to that conflict, Warden Bell had improved St. Stephen's academic reputation and its physical plant substantially ("History," 1951, p. 10). But at this point, new financial backing became imperative.

In 1927, in response to this fiscal pressure, the Board of Trustees membership was enlarged to include non-Churchmen. However, the favored individuals, the non-Episcopalians, failed to signal their

enthusiasm for the honor accorded them in the form of any significant monetary contributions. The Board then turned for help to Columbia, early in 1928 (Note 2, pp. 110-112). The long and often hostile relationship with Columbia was thus initiated.[2]

Columbia University. A union with Columbia had first been suggested in 1899, but at that time Columbia had little need for Bard. But in 1927, Columbia had had three applicants for each available opening in its Freshmen class. The chanelling of this excess of applicants to an affiliated St. Stephen's would, it was reasoned, enhance Columbia's influence without increasing its size beyond what was considered educationally sound. Furthermore, the offer from the St. Stephen's Board carried with it no assumption of financial responsibility. St. Stephen's expected to gain increased enrollment as a result of restored prestige accruing from the association with Columbia, thus alleviating its financial difficulties. So on April 18, 1928, St. Stephen's became part of the university; self-governing, but under the supervision of Columbia. Dr. Nicholas Butler, President of Columbia, became also President of St. Stephen's and "one of St. Stephen's best and most powerful friends" ("History," 1955-56, p. 86).

---

[2] The Bardian printed this editorial comment in September, 1938. "Only two others and ourselves heard the latest Bard publicity--over a nationwide N.B.C. hook-up at that! It was 1:10 A.M. last Wednesday. . . . 'Tonight's program is dedicated to Columbia University,' said the announcer. He went on to tell about its history, its buildings, and what a really great place it was. Then--this illuminating bit! 'A few years ago Columbia acquired Camp Columbia in Connecticut and rustic Bard, which thousands of Columbia students attend every summer.' With that . . . , we all sat down again, and over hamburgers discussed who would be Woodcraft Councillor in charge of Friendly Indians next summer." (Editorial, Note 3, p. 2)

This union failed to improve the financial picture; the Crash of 1929 intensified the need for substantial new endowment funds. Magee reported that "the institution was still living 'from hand to mouth' . . . from year to year" (Note 2, p. 116). The college deficit by 1931 was $80,000, despite a direct gift from Vincent Astor of $100,000 (pp. 116-117). Bell then turned back to Columbia with a request that it assume responsibility for the finances of the College. Columbia hedged on total responsibility, but offered the first of a long series of loans. This one was to meet St. Stephen's critical needs for the current year--one half of the 1932 deficit of $50,000, a minimal response to the urgent plea from Warden Bell.

In June, 1933, Warden Bell left St. Stephen's.

> Differences had arisen between the Board of Trustees and Bell over problems of finance and other matters, and the Trustees felt that his period of usefulness to the College had come to an end. His departure was not without unpleasantness for all concerned. (p. 120)

The Tewksbury years. Two important changes were initiated following Warden Bell's dismissal. The appointment of Donald Tewksbury as Dean had a significant influence upon the educational history of the College (discussed below), since he brought with him a new concept for education at the College. The change in name, from St. Stephen's to Bard, was designed to have a similar impact upon the financial situation of the institution.

Tewksbury, in the first of many subsequent requests to the Trustees, declared in his proposal, An Educational Program for Bard College:

> It is imperative that the acting administration advance a general plan of reorganization and outline a program of educational procedure, which, if accepted, will lead to the establishment of the College on a sound financial and educational basis for the future. (Tewksbury, Note 4, p. 1)

The name change was formally voted by the Trustees of St. Stephen's on May 18, 1934.

> The principal reason for the action was that the old name was undoubtedly the cause of general misapprehension that the College was a theological seminary. This was believed to have the effect of keeping out of St. Stephen's young men who might otherwise have gone there--not men prejudiced against a college with church connections, but men of high standing and character who wanted to go to a college offering a general education, including modern training in the physical and social sciences, history and literature. (Harison, Note 5, p. 1)

The facts prompting this action were that St. Stephen's had survived operating deficits of $79,537 and $50,216 for the years ending in June, 1933 and 1934, respectively, only by virtue of substantial loans from Columbia ($20,650 and $16,481); contributions from the Protestant Episcopal Society for Promoting Religion and Learning in the State of New York ($17,500 each year); and income from endowment funds (Gall, Note 6). A change of name, it was hoped, would, in combination with the Tewksbury educational program, attract more students and provide increased operating income.

Neither course of action produced the desired outcomes. President Reamer Kline in 1963 commented:

> Though the College acquired a wide reputation in the communities of contemporary arts, letters, and liberal thought, no supporting constituency for this program was found to take the place of the former church-centered one. Except for one "temporary" edifice built in 1936 by Columbia, not a single new building was erected nor any major enlargement of academic facilities achieved in the entire period of 1928-1959 (save for a single dormitory built on an H H F A loan). (Note 1, p. 1)

But it was with optimism that Dean Tewksbury began his long struggle to establish his new program for Bard and to place the College upon a sound financial footing. His efforts to fund his program failed, and led to his removal as Dean in 1938. The unhappy sequence of events was a succession of crises, some threatening the very existence of the infant Bard.

The early response to the Bard Program was encouraging. The student newspaper The Lyre Tree in the fall of 1934 reported on Page One: "LARGE REGISTRATION INDICATES INTEREST IN BARD PROGRAM: Number of Students Shows Substantial Increase Over Last Year" ("Large Registration," Note 7, p. 1). In September of 1936, The Bardian reported: "BARD BEGINS 3RD YEAR; LARGE FRESHMAN CLASS" ("Bard Begins," Note 8, p. 1); and Dean Tewksbury was quoted as remarking upon the "increased enrollment" ("From the Dean," Note 9, p. 1). Yet the financial situation remained dismal.

On October 6, 1936, the Dean in an informal report to the Board of Trustees presented the unwelcome data. In spite of an increase in annual tuition from $360 to $700 during the past three years; in spite of a doubling of student income during that time span, the "problem of the relation of expenses to income, is, however, exactly where it was three years ago" ("Report of Board," Note 10, pp. 87-88). The need, he insisted, was for a stable income, a need underlined by data showing total deficits of $3,617, $42,398, $43,289 for 1933-34, 1934-35, and 1935-36, respectively and an estimate for 1936-37 of $76,557 (p. 95). Calculation shows that the percent of total deficit relative to total operating expense was about 3%, 18%, 18% and esti-

mated 27% for the years in question. It was apparent that the new educational plan (begun in 1934) was considerably more expensive than the old. The Trustees must, Tewksbury implied, show their support for the new Bard by securing adequate financing, beyond the insufficient loans advanced by Columbia (p. 88).

When, in February of 1937, the Dean projected an operating deficit of at least $80,000 for the year of 1937-38, the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Columbia Board of Trustees stated that Columbia would offer no more financial aid to Bard ("Report of Board," Note 11, p. 133). On March 30, 1937, a group of Trustees met and discussed the possibility of suspending operation of the College for one year, a situation forced "solely through lack of funds" ("Report of Joint Meeting," Note 12, p. 22).

Dean Tewksbury intimated at this time that the conditions for his continuation at Bard included the underwriting by the Trustees (or some other source) of the budget as he had presented it. The full Board debated this proposal on April 6, and sought solutions to the financial crisis. A curtailed budget was suggested, in an atmosphere charged with feeling.

> President Butler commented emphatically upon the real worth of Bard College. . . . He stated that he had been and was greatly concerned about the situation, especially if the College should be closed or suspended. In his opinion, The Trustees of the College would come in for severe public criticism and that such closing or suspension could not be satisfactorily explained in view of the comparatively small sum required to meet the operating deficit contemplated by the proposed amended budget. ("Trustees," Note 13, pp. 140-141)

The meeting closed with additional provocative remarks from one of the Trustees:

> If the Trustees of the College have lost faith or interest in it, they should, instead of suspending or closing the College, frankly admit their loss of faith and interest and yield their responsibilities to others of greater faith and interest (p. 148).

By the time of the April 14'th meeting, Dean Tewksbury was ready to take a firm stand:

> Dean Tewksbury requested the floor in order to state his views regarding the financial situation of the College and the proposed resolution [for an amended budget]. He said that he believed that reports of financial instability had become known to the faculty, students and students' parents. . . . He personally felt it unwise to continue the College on any such reduced budget or on any budget unless it were adopted as part of a longer term program, at least three years, to which the Trustees would commit themselves. Dean Tewksbury intimated that if the Trustees should adopt the proposed amended budget, he must feel entirely free to decide whether or not he would continue with Bard College beyond June 30, 1937. ("Report of the Board," Note 14, p. 156)

President Butler had, prior to this crucial meeting, already espoused his views: adopt the reduced budget without any long term commitment. Bard, he felt, could continue "if necessary, without Dean Tewksbury." Although Butler was absent from this meeting, his presence was felt: the vote was taken; the amended budget was accepted. And then on May 4'th the moment of decision arrived for Dean Tewksbury. When asked directly if he planned to continue at Bard, he reiterated his reservations about the wisdom of the Trustees' decision. President Butler then suggested that he leave the room. Butler commented to the assembled Trustees "about the strain of the past five years upon Dean Tewksbury and his need for a rest." The Dean was accordingly given a leave of absence for health reasons from July 1, 1937 to January 1, 1938. Professor Mestre of the Bard Biology department was immediately appointed Director of Studies, and Dean Hawkes of Columbia became

Acting Dean ("Trustees," Note 15, pp. 160-161).

On November 3, 1937, Tewksbury formally resigned, stating that his action was a response to the financial situation at the College. The Board of Trustees accepted his resignation with "deep regret" ("Report of Board," Note 16). The Bardian wrote:

> The Board of Trustees gave no reason for Dr. Tewksbury's resignation, except that he wished to devote his time to educational work in other fields. ("Dean Tewksbury Quits," Note 17, p. 1)

Tewksbury's position on the financial situation may be interpreted in several ways. It might be that he himself had lost faith and interest in the future of the college or perhaps in his own future as Dean of an institution always close to extinction. Or possibly his hard line with the Trustees was a gamble designed to force a long term commitment from the Board as an indication of a belief in his Program. If so, the gamble lost.[3] Thus the Tewksbury years came to an end. But the fiscal problems were not solved. Crisis piled upon crisis, and Dean Mestre continued the struggle briefly.

The Mestre days. Columbia found itself, in the first year of Mestre's administration, faced with the call to provide an additional loan of $30,000 to allow Bard to complete the year 1937-38, and was told that the deficit for the coming year would probably be $75,000 ("Extract from Report," Note 19). In response, the Columbia Trustees did conditionally offer the loan of $30,000, but only for use in the 1938-39

---

[3] It is ironic to take note of a small article which appeared in The Bardian, November 18, 1938. It chronicled the closing of New College, "Columbia's experimental progressive wing of Teachers' College," for financial reasons. The Head of New College at the time was Dr. Tewksbury ("Lack of Money," Note 18, p. 4).

academic year. However, the Bard Trustees, noting that at the current level of deficit spending, the capital funds of Bard would be exhausted by June of 1938, resolved, in spite of the loan, to suspend operation of the College for one year, effective at the end of the school year ("Report of Board," Note 20).

Considerable chaos followed the announcement of the proposed closing of Bard. Dr. Mestre had, apparently, been severely criticized during his early months, and, some faculty felt, unfairly. A group of faculty wrote to the Trustees in his defense:

> The writers of this letter have been informed . . . that in making its decision to close the College the Board of Trustees has been influenced not merely by considerations of finance but by the belief that Dr. Mestre has been unable to command the support and confidence of the faculty and students and that the unity of purpose of the college have suffered irreparably in consequence.
>
> Such a representation of the condition of the College is very far from the truth. . . . Anyone familiar with academic life knows that a change of administration is inevitably followed by a period of adjustment. . . . The head of a college can hardly expect to escape criticism. . . . How little actual effect it has had . . . may be judged from the fact that some of us have not encountered it at all. Certainly, the work and the spirit of the College have not suffered. ("Letter," Note 21)

The Trustees assured the faculty that Mestre's administration of the College was not part of the decision to close Bard. However, contrary to the faculty's expressed opinion, the effect of the threat of suspension, rumored and real, had, according to the students, been disastrous to the educational life on campus.

> From the beginning of last year [1937-38] there was evident a widespread slackening in the machinery of the whole college program, the atmosphere was beginning to change. Classes were conducted in a less serious, a less inquisitive tone than before. Conferences and worksheets became . . . the subject of farces. The library circulation dropped amazingly. . . .

> As every old member of the college so well remembers, almost complete chaos ruled during those dubious months. . . . Intellectual efforts in general were almost completely at a standstill. . . . Mercenary questions continue to dominate all others. (D.S., Note 22, pp. 1,2) [Underlining added.]

Nevertheless, a general clamour arose to save Bard. A select Faculty Committee was formed to reason with the Trustees; the Senior class wrote in defense of Dr. Mestre and of Bard; a Special Committee of Trustees of Columbia and Bard was created. The Bardian headlines on March 18'th read: "COMMITTEE FINDS VERY LITTLE HOPE OF BARD OPENING." Dr. Mestre was quoted as charging that "there is no unity in New York. . . . We are at present without a Board of Trustees." Faculty on the select Committee agreed: "There has been no effective leadership on the part of anybody in New York. . . . The Board has completely let the college down" ("Committee," Note 23, pp. 1,2). In the same issue of The Bardian, some students turned their anger upon Mestre, and called for his resignation, claiming that his handling of the job "as educational dean is affecting scholastic standing . . . on campus" (apparently a running dispute that continued for sometime thereafter).[4]

---

[4]This same article implied a past dissatisfaction with Dr. Mestre. "It seems perfectly logical then, that if there are those who feel this way about the situation, that it would be the best thing they could do to circulate a petition--or better still, a vote by secret ballet (in order that the seniors might be better protected than they were by the last petition)--in order to definitely ascertain the feeling of the whole campus. The results would not be a "resignation from you, Jack" but a resignation from a majority opinion of the whole campus. . . . Once the vote were taken, it would be up to Dr. Mastre to decide" (The Bardian, Note 24, p. 2). On March 21, 1939, Dr. Mestre "made an oral report to the Trustees minimizing the importance of the letter from students dated February 27, 1939 and of any rumors or criticisms with respect to the administration of Bard College; attributing the occurences to unrest because of the uncertainty as to the future of the College" ("Report of Board," Note 25). The notes of the meeting showed a subsequent discussion "of the administrative

The combined strategies of all concerned, coupled with the proposals by Dr. Mestre to increase the tuition rates and a successful fund drive on campus, convinced the Trustees to rescind the resolution to suspend the operation of the College ("Report of Board," Note 27). Dr. Mestre was according officially appointed Dean. The exuberance of the students was duly recorded.

> The entire student body and faculty assembled in a noisy, joyful mob at the Barrytown Station on Monday night, March 21, to welcome Dr. Harold Mestre and the faculty committee back from a finally successful attempt to persuade the board of trustees to allow the college to remain open next year. . . . Following the riotous greeting at the station, which had been accompanied by horns, Roman candles, and hoarse voices, the crowd piled into cars and woke up the countryside on its return to the campus. A huge bonfire was in full blaze when the procession arrived. A meeting was held in the theatre where each statement of the speakers was uproariously approved.

The new Dean remarked that the decision of the Board implied that the college would continue: "The $30,000 voted by the Board of Trustees of Columbia University was specifically to be made available for use in 1938-39 only on the assumption that the college is to go on" ("Trustees Approve," Note 28, p. 1). [Underlining added.] The Bard Trustees, in accepting Columbia's loan, were then committed to the future of Bard.

The Dean and the students, relieved that the trying period of uncertainty was over, proceeded to return to their normal pursuits. Dean Mestre, in December, promoted his Three Year Plan of operation, hoping, no doubt, to seize the occasion and secure the long-range

---

situation at Bard College." About this time, Butler in an interview for The Bardian expressed concern "about Dean Harold Mestre. The president was disturbed by the thought that the dean was over-working himself" ("Butler," Note 26, p. 1), a sentiment that might fairly be deemed ominous, in light of Tewksbury's experience.

committment of the Trustees that Tewksbury had sought in vain.[5] Students responded with a vigorous opposition, charging, as one of their major objections, that the raise in tuition to the proposed level would lead to an elitist population.

> Selection will be on the applicant's financial status rather than on his academic merit and ability to contribute to the intellectual life of the college. It is already evident that there is a definite trend in that direction. . . . We feel . . . that the Three Year Plan subordinates educational practice to financial conditions" ("Mestre Answers Students," Note 29, p. 1)[6]

The Dean, the article noted, reacted to these complaints by "praising the students for the interest in the college and then tearing down each of their 'constructive' criticisms."

President Butler, meanwhile, had given an optimistic interview to The Bardian, seeing Bard as "facing forward."

> The president was asked, in view of the college's narrow escape from collapse last year and the subsequent weak financial structure, to comment upon the future of Bard. President Butler gave no intimation whatsoever that the thought of closing the college was entertained ("Butler Sees Bard," Note 26, p. 1).

But amidst all this pleasantly normal activity, the Trustees of Columbia and Bard were reacting much differently. On December 6, the

---

[5]No copy of this Plan was found, but it was alluded to in the report of the March 21'st meeting of the Bard Trustees (Note 25). However, much of its content can be inferred from student opposition to it, formalized in the February 27'th letter to the Trustees, the text of which was published in The Bardian ("Mestre Answers Student Criticism," Note 29, pp. 1,4).

[6]Data are available to support the students' claim that the rapid increases in tuition had produced demographic changes in the student population. Calculations show that the percent of Bard students that had entered from private schools had steadily increased. The figure was 49% in 1936 ("Summary," October 1936, p. 2); grew to 68% in 1939 ("Summary," May 1939, p. 56); and by November of that year stood at 81% ("Summary," November 1939, p. 14).

Columbia Trustees took steps to secure Bard's indebtedness ($232,700 plus accrued interest) by demanding a mortgage upon Bard's assets ("Report of Board," Note 30).[7] Beyond executing the requested mortgage, the Bard Trustees had done little until suddenly they again voted to suspend the college. A confidential letter sent to each Trustee (See Appendix B1) supports the general complaint at Bard that the Trustees "had let the college down."[8] The letter noted that the February 7'th Trustee meeting had been adjourned for lack of a quorum, as was the March 8'th meeting. At the March 21'st meeting, attended by only ten of twenty-one Trustees, it had been voted to suspend the college as of June 30, 1939. Noting the small number of Trustees who had made the vital decision, those trustees present then chose, the letter continued, to adjourn to March 27'th for further consideration of the resolution. A call for full attendence was issued ("Letter," Note 33).

However, the March 27'th meeting was no better attended. A fiery debate ensued. The Trustees, responding in part to letters from students, faculty, and alumni, reversed their decision once more. But the decisive influence was probably the offer of one of its members to accept the position of Vice-Chairman of the Board and with it the

---

[7] According to Dr. Rosenthal, Chairman of the Division of Natural Science and Mathematics at Bard, when, in 1978, the college sought a mortgage on certain of its properties, Columbia insisted upon a large cash release upon the basis of this old mortgage. This was apparently an unexpected development. It was only when Bard was able to meet this demand that "escape from Columbia" became a reality. (Rosenthal, Note 31)

[8] Bell (cited by Magee, Note 2, p. 116) registered a similar complaint in 1930: "The financial difficulty of the College at present is due to a combination of bad times and unfortunate postponement, on the part of the directing board of trustees, of raising endowment funds."

responsibility for Bard and the task of reorganizing the Board. One of his colleagues wrote him: "I feel that the success of the institution now depends on your securing a new group, preferably largely made up of local men and alumni" (Ellis, Note 34).

In September of 1939, during the first week of classes, Dean Mestre died. For not quite two years he had struggled with a diffident Board, with critical faculty and students. The days of his tenure were marked with disorder, disquiet, and uncertainty about the future. With the planned reorganization of the Board new hope had seemed to arise. But Dr. Mestre's days at Bard ended with only the prospects of a brighter future, with a record only of constant crisis, adversely affecting academic life.

It remained for Bennington's President, Robert Leigh, and one of his faculty, Dr. Gray, to secure for Bard some degree of financial stability and to allow the emphasis to shift from the financial to the educational aspects of the program.

The contingent from Bennington. The death of Mestre was yet another crisis in the tumultuous development of Bard. The College had but a one year commitment from Columbia, who was itself carrying a large deficit.[9] Mestre's Three Year Plan had not been approved; students were in opposition to such changes as had been proposed in order to increase the College's chances of survival. But suddenly, there was no administration at all, good or bad. Immediate action was imperative.

---

[9]Columbia's deficit in March of 1938 was reported to be $400,000 ("Copy," Note 35, p. 1).

It was to Bennington that the College turned for succour.[10] President Leigh of Bennington became Acting Dean for the remainder of the semester. He was charged by the Trustees to carry out the functions of the Dean and in addition to "make an analysis of the College to be reported to the Trustees" ("Report of Board," Note 37).[11]

It was President Leigh, whose eloquence had promoted and protected Bennington in its earliest days, who finally convinced the Bard Trustees to make a commitment for a term longer than a year. He recommended several actions: the reorganization of the Board, a Five Year financial plan providing guarantees of $160,000 (shared by Columbia), and extensive improvements to the plant ("Report of Board," Note 37). This was adapted to a Four Year Plan, and, after some uncertainty, approved by both the Bard Trustees and by Columbia University ("Report of Board," Note 38). Dr. Charles Harold Gray, Chairman of the Literature Division at Bennington, became Leigh's successor in January, 1940 (Benezet, p. 111). A brief period of relative quiet ensued.[12] Dean Gray at the end of his first semester at Bard (1940) reported a surplus

---

[10] Benezet reported, in his study of Bard, that Dean Tewksbury, who taught at Sarah Lawrence before going to Bard, had, during his years at Bard, often conferred with President Leigh (Benezet, 1943/1971, p. 117, f. 20).

[11] Leigh's "Final Report to the President and Trustees of Bard College" (mimeographed) was quoted by Benezet, and preliminary drafts were referred to in the Trustee's Report of December 19, 1939. (Note 37) It could not be located for the purposes of this study. However, much of its content has been inferred from the later reports of discussions in Trustee meetings.

[12] However, one of Gray's major problems was the loss of accreditation. The Association of American Universities, he reported, had suspended Bard for financial instability in 1939 (Gray, Note 39).

of income ($18,000) over budgeted expenditures, owing, he conjectured, to increased enrollment and a slower than expected pace of renovation ("Trustees," Note 40). Unfortunately, World War II approached with the disruptions of the draft and a new set of fiscal woes. Before the Four Year Plan had even run its course, the Dean had to report to the faculty that it might be necessary to keep the College open on a reduced basis ("Minutes of Faculty Meeting," Note 41). That was in April of 1943. Again, Bard lived under a recurring threat of extinction--suspension voted by the Trustees on April 24, 1943 ("Minutes of Joint Meeting," Note 42); warded off by the acquisition of an ASTP unit on campus ("Minutes of a Runup Meeting," Note 43, p. 53); followed by the loss of the ASTP unit and again possible suspension of the College ("Minutes of Faculty Meeting," Note 45, p. 63).

Bard's difficulties, it may be noted, continued unabated past the time span with which this study is concerned. President Reamer Kline reported the charge by the 1953 Middle States evaluation team that Bard had sustained a deficit every year but one in the decade 1943-53 (Kline, Note 1, p. 4). He presented other data, such as the fact that there had been an annual average deficit of $70,132 from 1951-1960. The years 1960-1962 were "the first two consecutive years of operation 'in the black' since the late 1920's" (p. 5).

Another evaluation team from the Middle States Commission, this time in 1963 drew a major conclusion, one in keeping with this extended financial history:

> The first and most basic [problem area] is that of maintaining at Bard the present commitment to individualized instruction in the face of financial limitations and planned increases in

> enrollment. . . . It seems clear that Bard will have to settle for a more conventional first two years. ("An Evaluation," Note 46, p. 5)

Here is yet another example of academic change proposed as a fiscal necessity, a pattern already well-established. It adds yet another item to the long list: secularization, the "scholarly" union with Columbia; the development of a new educational program; the new name; the firing of a Dean; rapid tuition increases which changed the demography of the student population; the dis-union from Columbia; the advent of women on campus. Most of these were proposed on educational grounds; all were, at least in part, efforts to keep Bard afloat financially.

Reference Notes

1. Kline, R. Bard College. A self-evaluation for the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. February 1, 1963.

2. Magee, C. The history of St. Stephen's College. 1960-1933. 1950. Unpublished Senior Project, Bard College.

3. Editorial. The Bardian, September 23, 1938, p. 2.

4. Tewksbury, D. An educational program for Bard College. March 1st, 1934. A preliminary statement for the consideration of the Board of Trustees. Mimeographed.

5. Harison, W. Letter to the Trustees of St. Stephen's College, May 21, 1934.

6. Gall, C. Audit for St. Stephen's College, June 30, 1934.

7. Large registration indicates interest. The Lyre Tree, September 10, 1934, pp. 1-2.

8. Bard begins 3rd year; Large freshman class. The Bardian, September 15, 1936, p. 1

9. From the Dean. The Bardian, September 15, 1936, p. 1.

10. Report of Board of Trustees, October 6, 1936, pp. 87-95.

11. Report of Board of Trustees, February 2, 1937, pp. 133-135.

12. Report of Joint Meeting of Executive, Finance and Education Committeee of the Board of Trustees of Bard College, March 30, 1937, pp. 19-24.

13. Report of Board of Trustees of Bard College, April 6, 1937, pp. 137-150.

14. Report of Board of Trustees, April 14, 1937, pp. 156-157.

15. Report of Board of Trustees, May 4, 1937, pp. 160-167.

16. Report of Board of Trustees, November 3, 1937.

17. Dean Tewksbury quits position as head of Bard. The Bardian, November 5, 1937, p. 1.

18. Lack of money to cause ending of New College. The Bardian, November 18, 1938, p. 4.

19. Extract from report of the committee on finance of the Trustees of Columbia University, January 3, 1938.

20. Report of Board of Trustees, January 26, 1938.

21. Letter to the Board of Trustees of Bard College, February 15, 1938.

22. D.S., Letters to the editor. The Bardian, October 7, 1938, pp. 1, 2.

23. Committee finds very little hope of Bard opening. The Bardian, March 18, 1938, pp. 1-2.

24. Editorial. The Bardian, March 18, 1934, p. 2.

25. Report of Board of Trustees, February 7, 1939, March 21, 1939.

26. Butler sees Bard "Facing Forward." The Bardian, February 17, 1939, pp. 1, 4.

27. Report of Board of Trustees, March 21, 1938.

28. Trustees approve continuing Bard. The Bardian, April 1, 1938, pp. 1, 4.

29. Mestre answers student critics of 3 year plan. The Bardian, March 3, 1939, pp. 1, 4.

30. Report of Board of Trustees, December 6, 1938.

31. Rosenthal, M. Personal interview. November, 1979.

32. Bell, B. The Lyre Tree, December 16, 1930.

33. James, O. Letter to the Board of Trustees, Attached to Report of Board of Trustees, February 7, 1939. March 27, 1939.

34. Ellis, G. Letter to Mr. Freeborn. Attached to the Report of the Board of Trustees, February 7, 1939, March 27, 1939.

35. Copy of report by faculty committee. The Bardian, March 18, 1938, p. 1.

36. Report of Board of Trustees, October 24, 1939.

37. Report of Board of Trustees, December 19, 1939.

38. Report of Board of Trustees, March 12, 1940.

39. Gray, H. Report of the Dean to the President of the University and the members of the Board of Trustees at Bard College, April 15, 1941.

40. Report of the Dean to the Board of Trustees of Bard College, June 7, 1941.

41. Minutes of faculty meeting, April 19, 1943.

42. Minutes of joint meeting of the faculty, with a committee of the Board of Trustees, April 24, 1943.

43. Minutes of a runup meeting of the faculty, July 2, 1943.

44. Minutes of emergency meeting of the faculty, February 19, 1944.

45. Minutes of faculty meeting, April 15, 1944.

46. An evaluation of the educational effectiveness of Bard College, March 4-6, 1963.

Reference List

Benezet, L. General education in the progressive college. New York: Arno Press, 1971. (Originally published, 1943.)

Gray, C. A summary of the Dean's report to the Trustees of Bard College. The Bard College Bulletin, 1940-41, pp. 3-7.

Hapson, G. Reminiscences of St. Stephen's College. New York: E.S. Gorhav, 1910.

History of the college. The Bard College Bulletin, January 1951, pp. 9-11.

History of the college. The Bard College Bulletin, 1955-56, pp. 85-87.

Summary of enrollment. The Bard College Bulletin, October, 1936, p. 2.

Summary of enrollment. The Bard College Bulletin, May, 1939, p. 56.

Summary of enrollment. The Bard College Bulletin, November, 1939, p. 14.

APPENDIX E

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Preliminary research on this study led into a review of four main areas. These were: (1) the history of science in higher education, (2) the history of the progressive education movement, (3) the educational philosophy of John Dewey, and (4) the early history of the progressive colleges.

History of Science in Higher Education

The origins of modern science have been delineated by a number of scholars. George Sarton (1952/1959), a pioneer in the formation of the History of Science Society in 1924 and also active in the establishment of History of Science as an academic field, has published several extensive volumes on the general topic. The colonial educational experience has been examined by Cremin (1970). Bertrand Russell (1945), in The History of Western Philosophy, devoted a chapter to the rise of science. He presented the scientists of the seventeenth century (Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton), the progenitors of the science of today. Taton, in the chapter on "Humanism and Encyclopedism" included in the volume The Beginnings of Modern Science from 1450-1800, also recorded the Rennaissance awakening to science (1955/1964). The struggle to introduce science into higher education has been described by Hornberger in Scientific Thought in the American Colleges:

1638-1800 (1945). He traced the history of eight early colleges, from Harvard, chartered in 1636, through Yale, William and Mary, Princeton, Brown, and Dartmouth. He showed in detail how Newtonian science won the day over the early concern with classical languages and theological studies.

Brubacher and Rudy (1958/1976) and Butts (1939) have chronicled the revolt against the strict prescription of courses in the years from 1800-1910. This elective struggle involved among other issues the proper role of science in the education of students. As the successors to Newton appeared (Rutherford, Priestley, Lavoisier, Galvani, and Volta), and as the Industrial Revolution gained speed, educational systems in Europe were being rejuvenated by such philosophers as Pestalozzi, Kant, Froeble, and Hebart, forerunners of progressive thought in education. By 1850 science and scientific research were in the forefront in the German universities, and were influencing the American institutions. Now "scientific schools" were founded--Lawrence School of Science at Harvard and Chandler at Dartmouth. Clearly free election and science available to all was a burning issue with a series of men such as Jefferson, Ticknor, and Charles Eliot of Harvard. As a result, free election won its battle at least for a time and science took its place in the realm of intellectual endeavors.

History of Progressive Education

The earliest years of the progressive education movement produced innovations largely affecting lower levels of schooling. Gradually such practices touched higher levels. Some historians have seen

progressive educational practice and philosophy as derivative of the larger political progressivism in America at the time (Cremin, 1961). In order to understand the early progressive colleges, then, it is necessary to explore the origins of progressive philosophy in its transition from politics to higher education. Noble, in The Progressive Mind, 1890-1917 (1970), focused on the prominent thinkers in progressivism. The progressive era in politics has been concisely viewed by Richard Hofstadter in The Progressive Movement: 1900-1915 (1963) and in detail in The Age of Reform (1955). He noted the enormous growth of industry after the Civil War, the expansion of the frontier, the multiplication of farms and acreage as well as urban development. The reaction to the social ills generated by this undisciplined procreation produced in the time from 1900-1915 the "muckrakers," settlement houses, a "social gospel" promoted by the Protestants, and educational reform. The Progressive Party itself died with the advent of World War I, but the educational movement was far from moribund. Wiebe in The Search for Order (1967) looked at the events of the progressive era as the results of the struggle of a new and growing middle class to fulfill its destiny. Cremin (1961) has undertaken to understand the progressive era in its role in the transformation of the school. Although the bulk of his book deals with pre-college education, it is useful since he examined important trends which influenced the early progressive colleges.

The literature on the progressive movement in education is extensive. The chief bibliography is by Herbst, The History of American Education (1973). Park's bibliography, The Rise of American Education:

An Annotated Bibliography (1965), is excellent and contains thirteen pages on progressive education alone (pp. 134-146). Cremin's bibliography is also a fundamental resource. Cordasco and Brickman in A Bibliography of American Educational History (1975) list published bibliographies on higher education (pp. 7-8) and on general works (pp. 97-131). The most recent bibliography is by Winick; The Progressive Education Movement: An Annotated Bibliography (1979). Kornegay's unpublished bibliographies, The Progressive Education Movement and A Selected Bibliography in the Historical Foundations of American Education, are particularly pertinent.

The Educational Philosophy of John Dewey

This study seeks to extrapolate Dewey's philosophy toward a model for higher education and notably towards the role of science in the progressive college. Although Dewey has written comparatively little on higher education, two books seem most useful at this level. They are The Educational Situation (1902b/1969) and The Way Out of Educational Confusion (1931/1970). Since inquiry, based on scientific method, was for Dewey the heart of educational theory, an important source is his Logic--The Theory of Inquiry (1938b/1960). In a similar vein was his earlier book, completely revised in 1933, How We Think (1910/1933). The role of the child (and a source of "child-centered" education) may be understood in The Child and the Curriculum (1902a/1974). The role of education in society, another important aspect of Dewey's thought, is elaborated in Democracy and Education (1916/1966), as well as in The School and Society (1900/1974).

Dewey's reflections on progressive education itself may be found in Experience and Education (1938a) and in Sources of a Science of Education (1929). Useful commentaries are John Dewey in Perspective by Geiger (1958/1974); Dewey on Education: Appraisals (Archambault, 1966/1969); and Guide to the Works of John Dewey (Boydston, 1970), a collection of essays and bibliographies. A centennial work, John Dewey: Master Educator (Brickman & Lehrer, 1959/1966), also a series of essays by "distinguished scholars interested in education," was designed as a tribute to Dewey, but serves as an excellent source of a variety of material. Thomas (1962) edited John Dewey, A Centennial Bibliography, a useful reference.

History of Early Progressive Colleges

Experimental colleges have been a subject of intense interest to educators. Studies of innovation in particular institutions are available. Bell (1966) has dealt with general education programs in the forties and fifties as they were implemented at Harvard, Columbia and Chicago. The Harvard "Redbook" (1945), a report of a faculty committee on general education, proposed educational changes and became a virtual Bible for progressive secondary schools.

Stickler published Experimental Colleges in 1964. Clark (1970) presented The Distinctive Colleges. Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. In Five Experimental Colleges MacDonald reported on Bensalem, Antioch-Putney Graduate School of Education, Franconia, S.U.N.Y. at Old Westbury, and Fairhaven (1973). Peck (1955) dealth with Berea, and Duberman (1972) with Black Mountain. Leuba's work on Arthur Morgan describes

his "pioneering in education, research, and industry--Antioch College" (1971). Henderson and Hall (1946) examined Antioch College and liberal education.

The best resources for the colleges in this study are also histories of individual institutions. Bennington College has been followed from its founding struggles by Jones in an excellent volume published in 1946. Its bibliography points one to many valuable primary sources. Benezet (1943) reviewed the early years of Bennington, Bard, and Sarah Lawrence. Butts and Cremin provide additional data. In The Perpetual Dream Grant and Riesman (1978) present a typology in which the colleges in this study are labeled as examples of telic reform, and the courses of such reform studied. Murphy and Raushenbush (1960) studied Sarah Lawrence students over a ten-year span and Newcomb, Koenig, Flack and Warwick (1967) looked at Bennington College students after twenty-five years. Beecher (1966) examined "an experiment in college curriculum organization" and briefly recounted the history of Goddard College.

This review covers the fundamental reading done in preparation for the proposed research.

Reference List

Archambault, R. Dewey on education: Appraisals. New York: Random House, 1969. (Originally published, 1966.)

Beecher, G. An experiment in college curriculum organization. Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1966.

Bell, D. The reforming of general education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Benezet, L. General education in the progressive college. New York: Arno, 1971. (Originally published, 1943.)

Boydston, J. (Ed.). Guide to the works of John Dewey. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Press, 1970.

Brickman, W., & Lehrer, S. (Eds.). John Dewey: Master educator. New York: Atherton Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1959.)

Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. Higher education in transition: An American history: 1631-1955. New York: Harper & Row, 1976. (Originally published, 1958.)

Butts, F.R. The college charts its course. New York: McGraw Hill, 1939.

Clark, B.R. The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Cordasco, F., & Brickman, W. A bibliography of American educational history. New York: AMS Press, 1975.

Cremin, L. The transformation of the school. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Cremin, L. American education: The colonial experience: 1607-1783. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Dewey, J. The school and society. In The child and the curriculum and The school and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. (Originally published, 1900.)

Dewey, J. The child and the curriculum. In The child and the curriculum and The school and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. (Originally published, 1902.) (a)

Dewey, J. The educational situation. New York: Arno Press, 1969. (Originally published, 1902.) (b)

Dewey, J. How we think. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1933. (Originally published, 1910.)

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Free Press, 1966. (Originally published, 1916.)

Dewey, J. Sources of a science of education. New York: Liveright, 1929.

Dewey, J. The way out of educational confusion. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970. (Originally published, 1931.)

Dewey, J. Experience and education. New York: Macmillon, 1938. (a)

Dewey, J. Logic--The theory of inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1960. (Originally published, 1938.) (b)

Duberman, M. Black Mountain: An exploration in community. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1972.

Geiger, G.R. John Dewey in perspective. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974. (Originally published, 1958.)

Grant, G., & Riesman, D. The perpetual dream: Reform and experiment in the American college. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Harvard Committee. General education in a free society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Henderson, A., & Hall, D. Antioch college: Its design for liberal education. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946.

Herbst, J. The history of American education. Northbrook, Illinois: AHM Publishing, 1973.

Hofstadter, R. (Ed.). The progressive movement: 1900-1915. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Hofstadter, R. The age of reform. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955.

Hornberger, T. Scientific thought in the American colleges: 1638-1800. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1945.

Jones, B. Bennington college. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946.

Kornegay, W. Selected bibliography in the historical foundations of American education. Unpublished bibliography with annotations, 1975. University of Massachusetts.

Kornegay, W. The progressive education movement. Unpublished bibliography with annotations, 1973, supplements 1974, 1978. University of Massachusetts.

Leuba, C.J. A road to creativity. North Quincy, Massachusetts: Christopher Publishing Corporation, 1971.

MacDonald, G.B. (Ed.). Five experimental colleges. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Murphy, L.B., & Raushenbush, E. (Eds.). Achievement in the college years: A record of intelligence and personal growth. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.

Newcomb, T.M., Koenig, K., Flacks, R., & Warwick, P. Persistance and change: Bennington college and its students after twenty-five years. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Noble, D.W. The progressive mind 1890-1917. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970.

Park, J. (Ed.). The rise of American education: An annotated bibliography. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Peck, E.S. Berea's first century: 1855-1955. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1955.

Russell, B. The history of western philosophy. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945.

Sarton, G. A history of science. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. (Originally published, 1952.)

Stickler, W.H. (Ed.). Experimental colleges (4 vols.). Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

Taton, R. (Ed.). The history of science. (Thames and Hudson, Trans.). New York: Basic Books, 1964. (Originally published, 1955.)

Thomas, M.H. (Ed.). John Dewey: A centennial bibliography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Wiebe, R. The search for order. New York: Hill & Wang, 1967.

Winick, M. The progressive education movement: An annotated bibliography. New York: Garland Press, 1979.